



**Maynooth
University**

National University
of Ireland Maynooth

**Brazilian Return Migration:
Debt, Freedom and Melancholia**

Diana Gouveia

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
of the Degree of PhD in Anthropology

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND MAYNOOTH

Department of Anthropology

October 2014

Head of Department: Dr. Mark H. Maguire

Supervisor: Dr. Mark H. Maguire

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------------|
| Acknowledgments | 4 |
| Summary | 5 |
| Introduction | 6 |
| Chapter 1: Three waves of Brazilian migration to Ireland: Reflections on policies and persons | 28 |
| Chapter 2: Debt, money and what binds us together | 80 |
| Chapter 3: For sale: from citizenship to shoes | 120 |
| Chapter 4: Melancholia and the loss of desire | 163 |
| Chapter 5: The unintended cosmopolitan | 193 |
| Conclusion | 225 |
| Bibliography | 235 |

DECLARATION

I hereby state that this dissertation has not been submitted in part or in whole to any other institution and is, except where otherwise stated, the original work of the author.

Signed _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This has been a long intellectual and emotional journey, and coming to the end of it, it is hard to pay tribute to all the people who have contributed at different stages, and who through their questions and probings helped me to form thoughts of my own. So I would like to thank all the friends and work colleagues who through their discussions have helped this project to move from an embryonic state to the present thesis. Without their support and friendship this would have been a much harder and less enjoyable journey. So, thank you for all the cups of tea that saved the day in times of ‘crisis’.

A big thank you to the department of Anthropology at NUI Maynooth, for their assistance, friendliness and for making complicated and bureaucratic things seem easy. That is priceless.

To Dr. Jamie A. Saris and Dr. Thomas Strong for their comments at key moments which provided significant insights.

My deepest thank you to all the Brazilian migrants in Ireland and in Brazil, and to their families, who allowed me into their lives, many of whom I now have the privilege of calling friends. I am humbled by their friendship and warmth, and I hope they can hear the echo of their voices throughout this thesis, and that I have done justice to the intimate confidences they shared with me. A special thanks to the Barreto family in Presidente Epitácio who I lived with and who treated me as one of their own.

Como diz o poeta Miguel Torga, ‘a vida é uma coisa imensa, que não cabe numa teoria’, e ao escrever esta tese sou consciente que muito fica por dizer. Ao longo dos anos de trabalho que por fim culminaram nesta tese muitos foram os amigos e as amigas que disponibilizaram o seu tempo e infinita paciência para conversar comigo e me deixaram entrar nas suas vidas, e por fim escrever sobre elas. A todos eles e a todas elas agradeço profundamente a amizade e o carinho com que me acolheram, em especial a família Barreto que me acolheu na sua casa durante a minha estadia em Presidente Epitácio.

Thank you is owed to my parents and family for encouraging me to pursue and ‘to do my own thing’, even when ‘doing my thing’ meant taking a turn from the path they had set for me. And then, once I had made up my mind and taken a particular direction, always reassuring me that no matter what happens I will always have at least one place I can call home.

I was recently told that the biggest challenge for a PhD supervisor is to resist the temptation to impose his or her ideas upon the student, to tell her where to go, what to do, what path to take, and instead let her ‘talk the talk, and walk the walk’, one step at the time. I am profoundly grateful to Dr. Mark H. Maguire for allowing and for always encouraging me to develop my own ideas, for his wise and assertive feedback which provided invaluable direction and guidance, and for having the ability to know ‘what I was on about’ before I could articulate it.

Finally, I thank Kieran Creaven, my husband and my best friend... I think that says it all.

SUMMARY

Migration policy has been dominated by ideas of ‘rootedness’ which ascribe people to territorial borders, and renders migrants as ‘uprooted’. However, increasingly, migrants reject the world map of fixed borders and maintain lives here and there, without necessarily ‘rooting’ themselves anywhere. In this thesis, I argue that a discussion on migration must inquire into the complexities of migration as a process that extends from pre-migration to possible re-migration, and whose parts are not reducible to a series of discontinuous and fixed events.

Research conducted in Ireland and in Brazil enabled me to go beyond and behind cultural and national common-sense assumptions and into the everyday life of Brazilian migrants to Ireland and in Brazil. Through an examination of relations of debt, kinship obligations, money, consumption, modernity, individual freedom, and melancholia which are prevalent matters in the lives of Brazilian migrants, I enquire into the everyday relations that migrants maintain with others and within which they constitute themselves. I argue that migration to Ireland enables a degree of individual freedom in economic terms and access to a world of consumption; it also offers the experience of an alternative form of modernity and the consideration of the possibility of a different kind of life. However, this possibility is nearly always articulated in the everyday in relation to the moral imperatives and commitments to kin in Brazil.

Whilst migrants display cosmopolitanism through the experience of migration they also remain deeply committed to traditional kinship expectations and patterns of reciprocity. I argue that, for Brazilian migrants, freedom is found in moments of ‘disjunction’ and within the balance achieved between obligations to kin and obligations to oneself. I also argue that migrants have the ability to become part of different nations and to belong to different communities without this implying a rupture with any of the two.

INTRODUCTION

We are born into the flow of palpable experience. With its symbolic meanings and social interactions our senses form into a pattern sensibility, our movement meet resistance and final direction, and our subjectivity emerges, takes shape, and reflexively shapes our local world.

-- Arthur Kleinman (1998: 359)

I was still in my early teens when I started thinking about migration. Every year I would see hundreds of migrants returning 'home', often with their cars full of what I thought were all sorts of new and modern things, things that I had never seen before or even heard about. They would bring VCRs and tapes with foreign language programmes that none of us could understand, and I remember sitting around watching the images, much like a young child peruses a book, and getting the synopsis and the occasional commentary from my cousin who once lived abroad. I do not remember feeling inadequate, though; in part because the novelty and the excitement by far outweighed any discomfort I might have felt. There were, however, two nagging thoughts that kept me wondering why emigrants, many of them family, kept coming back and kept going away. One was the fact that when they arrived they would come for a full month, most of the time they stayed with relatives or would move to the house or apartment which they had bought whilst living abroad, but apart from 'us', the relatives, they did not seem to maintain broader social relationships, at least none which would go beyond the niceties of everyday interaction; the only people the 'emigrants' seemed to interact with were relatives and other returned emigrants who, like them, were also on holidays. During that month of holidays, usually August, and much to the exasperation of adults but to the excitement of children, outings were constantly being planned which, of course, were expensive. However, migrants would spend as if their money had no end to it and they would invite everyone along, which, needless to say, would be received with a mixture of gratitude and irritation.

The other thought that kept me wondering was less obvious: it was the fact that I could not quite figure out if the 'emigrants', my relatives, were happy or unhappy to be

back 'home' and if they were equally happy or unhappy to depart once more to their new 'homes'. They certainly spoke about their new host countries positively: these were the countries where modern life was to be found if one was brave enough to look for it, countries where money seemed to 'grow on trees', and where everything 'worked properly'. But then, quiet conversations would be had in the kitchen and in the bedroom whilst packing, away from the constant coming and going of people, and these were sombre moments, mainly about the suffering, the loneliness, the inadequacy of living in a country they knew very little about. During that month of August everyone, migrants and non-migrants alike, seemed at the same time happy and deeply unhappy, and I could not understand the reasons lying behind such conflicting emotions.

I forgot about most of these thoughts and questions until I started conducting fieldwork with Brazilian migrants to Ireland, and to a large extent my own childhood perceptions of the suffering of the immigrant informed those first few months, if not years, of fieldwork carried out in Ireland between 2009 and 2012, and in Brazil from May to September 2011. As I aimed to examine the reasons underlying the decisions of Brazilian migrants living in Ireland to return to Brazil, it seemed to me then that the will and the motivations to return 'home' were visible in a certain unfamiliarity with Ireland which could be appreciated through the constant references to Brazil, the fact that only Portuguese was spoken in the houses which most Brazilians shared with others Brazilians, the national flags displayed around the house as well as the photographs neatly organised around the fireplace. The food, the language, the objects, every little thing cried Brazil, and I saw the suffering in it, as I saw the tears in the eyes of mothers and fathers when they spoke of their children, and the sadness of adult men and women when they spoke about their families in Brazil. What I saw then was an unquestionable wish to return to Brazil.

This perception changed over the years and in particular during the time I spent in Presidente Epitácio, in Brazil. On a mild winter night I went out to a well-known bar/restaurant for a portion of *peixe frito* (fried fish), a local specialty, with a group composed of two people who had never emigrated and one who had. As we arrived, one of my friends who had lived in Ireland asked me, ‘Will we go and say hello to them? They have all been to Ireland!’ I had not noticed that seated at a table a little further away were three women having *peixe frito* and a few beers. When I looked, I realised I knew one of them well from Ireland, and I had met the other two on occasions in Naas as well. As I went to say hello, my friend had already gone ahead, I left our other two friends to get a table for us. They were surprised to see me since they had returned to Brazil a year earlier, and we agreed to meet during the week for coffee and catch up. Every time I saw them over the following months I stayed in Brazil, they were either together or with family but I never saw them with any other friends who had not been to Ireland, which reminded me of my own relatives when they were on holidays. At one point they confirmed that their lives were now quite different from the one they had before emigrating, and because of that they tended to socialise amongst themselves. It was not only the amount of disposable income that differentiated them from their acquaintances but, rather, the experiences of Ireland. In fact, most conversations would directly or indirectly touch on Ireland, which was not always taken sympathetically by people who had not emigrated. In more personal and intimate conversations they would all talk about loneliness and a feeling of isolation within their social milieu, but I came to see their ‘pain’ not as the suffering of the migrant, as I would have sensed it before, but as the existential suffering of the cosmopolitan being, moving between different worlds that no longer offered the same unquestioned, comfortable sense of home.

It was at that point that I finally reconciled myself with the obvious, with that which had been the source of my lack of understanding from the beginning, the fact that

as long as I kept thinking about emigration, immigration and return migration as delimited and yet unitary processes, I would not be able to make sense of many of my observations and of conversations that I had during the course of my fieldwork. Whilst the initial aim of the research was to, through the experiences of Brazilian migrants to Ireland, trace and explore the role of sending and receiving countries which could provide a thinking platform for the study of return migration, fieldwork led me in different directions. As I continued with fieldwork, what transpired was that migrants' reflections on return, as reality or mere possibility, were less orientated and dominated by state policies than by the experience of a certain kind of modernity in Ireland and the ambivalent feelings that those experiences created. Whilst in Ireland migrants came into contact with a wider availability of money proper in daily life which afforded a degree of individual freedom that allowed for the development of new patterns of consumption. This newly acquired freedom could not, however, be disentangled from kinship obligations migrants sustained in Brazil, and introduced new complexities in the relationships amongst migrants, and migrants and non-migrants. These complexities required the re-working of traditional rules of moral reasoning and of new ways of evaluating investments in relationships -- credit and debt systems which in the past had served to maintain relational and kinship obligations were now facing challenges in the negotiation of daily interactions. And so, the everyday is inundated by difference and doubt, and all the complexities that these experiences exert in daily life in Ireland and in Brazil alike. These experiences do not stand alone, dissociated from past events and future expectations but, rather, coexist and shape future interactions. For this reason, I came to think about migration not as a set of clear, consecutive events: emigration, immigration, and return migration, but I came to reflect on it as experiences of uncertainty, as those experiences which, without being coherent or determinate, frame our present living.

The twists and turns of research on actually lived lives required distancing oneself from common academic discussions of migration as the institutionalised processes through which territorial borders and migration policies are formulated and reinforced, to a discussion of what Liisa Malkki calls a ‘sedentarism in our thinking’ (1992: 31). Malkki observes that at the heart of identity and territory discussions lies the assumption that people naturally belong to specific national territories, to ‘homeland’, and ‘fatherland’, and ‘motherland’, places we remain ‘rooted’ to even when we are absent. Furthermore, this absence impoverishes the national territory as does the presence of someone who does not rightfully belong. Malkki further notes that a sedentary logic justifies the concept of fixed and rigid national borders, with the result that the disorderly movement of people is considered a threat to the national stability of borders and a potential cause of erosion of the national cultural identity. Thus, migrants come to be understood and defined as ‘uprooted’ people, as not fully belonging. William Walters (2010: 240ff) contributes and furthers this discussion by suggesting that we are in the presence of ‘domopolitics’, through which the nation is construed as embodying the home as:

hearth, a refuge or a sanctuary in a heartless world; the home as our place, where we belong naturally, and where, by definition, others do not; international order as a space of homes — every people should have (at least) one; home as a place we must protect. We may invite guests into our home, but they come at our invitation; they don’t stay indefinitely. (Walters 2010: 241)

The fact is that migrants challenge these notions of the nation-state as ‘home’ and put to the test the ‘sedentary thinking’ that Malkki responds to. The experience of Brazilian migrants to Ireland and upon return to Brazil, shows that migrants often decline notions that ascribe them to a world map of fixed forms and build life-projects which are lived here and there, and build their ‘refuge’, their ‘place’ without necessarily waiting for a formal invitation. Therefore, migration is only partly about state

regulation, and is greatly influenced by the individual experience of the everyday with its suffering and hope.

Veena Das (2007) speaks about these moments when experience informs and shapes our daily lives, not in speakable terms but in everyday interactions. Through a 'descent into the ordinary' we can start to uncover the ways through which migrants inhabit a world which has been made strange through the experience of otherness and strangeness, and the loss of a comfortable sense of home. Hence, the question becomes not exclusively about the nation-state and state boundaries but rather about uncertainty. This uncertainty and slight unfamiliarity tends to be portrayed as suffering (see Sayad 1999), but I prefer to think about it as existential suffering (see Kleinman 1998; Jackson 2005; Das 2007), as a process of permanent personal and social metamorphosis, which arises from an awareness of understanding our place in the world, rather than a natural suffering caused by migration.

Therefore, I must distance myself from acculturation studies and psychological models of cultural adjustment which render migrants as suffering beings, a suffering which is often measured between the degree of success of acculturation and the maintenance of one's 'own culture' (MacLaughlin and O'Connell 2000). Through acculturation strategies which John W. Berry defines as the efforts and the mechanisms through which 'ethnocultural groups relate to each other and change as a result of their attempts to live together in culturally plural societies' (2005: 700), Berry explores the cultural and psychological aspects which take place during the process of acculturation, and the stress associated with them. The model he proposes fits a number of 'if not this' then 'this', which define contextual factors as influencing the psychology of group relations which lead to outcomes which can then be classified between 'harmony and effectiveness' and 'conflict and stress' (2005: 696). There are a number of issues concerning this approach, many of which have already been addressed in

anthropological writing. Gregory Bateson (1935) responded to the publication of the “A Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation” (Redfield et al.: 1936) by pointing out that categories to address the ‘problem of acculturation’ were premature since the ‘problem’ itself remained vague. It reveals a preoccupation with ‘contact’ between groups of people which may well be a reasonable problem when viewed in the light of a preoccupation with the maintenance of identity and territorial borders, however, it is based on the fallacy, as Bateson observes, that we can ‘classify traits of a culture’ under specific and fixed headings ready to be fulfilled and categorised. It also presumes that, in the case of migration, immigrant groups are themselves homogenous, and live fixed lives in sending and receiving countries. Moreover, the problematic in acculturation models is the ‘adaptation’ to the host society, where migrant populations are rendered as ‘in need’ of integration, hence analyses of the migrant’s world tend to be, as Abdelmalek Sayad argues, trapped between ‘abstract and reductive discourses’ (1999: 29). These discourses and models reduce migrant populations to broad and identifiable categories and open the path for the formulation of equally abstract and reductive solutions to the ‘*social problems of immigrants*’ (Sayad 1999: 178 [original emphasis]).

In *The Suffering of the Immigrant*, a book published posthumously, Sayad (1999) presents us with a fundamental proposition about the study of migration, and states what seems to be the obvious even if the obvious is often ignored in policy making, that is, that the migrant is first and foremost an emigrant. This proposition and many of the discussions and descriptions that Sayad has on debt, consumption and melancholia affecting Algerian migrants in France inform my own analysis, although we fundamentally take opposite directions insofar as Sayad (1999: 17) sees life in France and return to Algeria as ‘exile’, as life and return to a ‘foreign land’, whereas I suggest that Brazilian migrants find places of disjuncture in both sending and receiving countries where they feel that, at least, they partly belong. Nonetheless, Sayad

unequivocally states that if we are truly committed to investigating the experiences of migration and the mechanisms to which migrants are subjected, rather than devoting ourselves to explaining the situations that migrants find themselves in, an explaining which traditionally rests on the experiences of migrants in receiving countries, we must stay away from the emigrant-immigrant divide and retrace ‘complete trajectories’ (1999: 29) which allow for the migrant to be understood beyond the moment of migration as if, as Sayad notes, her life began the moment she emigrated. Hence, Sayad avers:

It is only through the total reconstruction of emigrants’ trajectories that we can understand the complete system of determinations which, having acted prior to their emigration and continuing to act, in a modified form, had brought emigrants, in the process of emigration, to their current point of arrival. (1999: 29)

Furthermore, Sayad argues, if we ignore the conditions of origin, studies of migration are bound to be ‘partial and ethnocentric’ (ibid.), and ultimately will have limited contributions to make to the study of migration broadly.

Traditionally, migration studies have tended to focus on the processes taking place in the receiving countries, partly Sayad suggests, because whilst immigration is rendered as problematic in the receiving country and is the result of a presence and thus hard to ignore politically, socially and culturally, emigration ‘finds expression in an absence’ (1999: 120) which is complex to define and easier to forget. But there is a broader issue here which Sayad (1999: 162) attributes to colonial history and current ‘relations of domination that prevail at international level’ between the ‘developed’ and the ‘underdeveloped’ world: Sayad’s analysis is largely focused on the experiences of Algerian peasants who migrated to France, a discussion which is taking place in the long shadow cast by the colonial history that ties the two countries together and colours the relationships that migrants forge with France and their kin and communities in Algeria. This is not the case between Brazil and Ireland, since both countries were, in

fact, colonised: Brazil was colonised by Portugal and declared its independence in 1822; Ireland achieved provisional independence from Great Britain some 100 years later. The conceptualisation of migration as a movement from colonised to coloniser and the implications stemming from this relationship that Sayad discusses is fundamentally different from the relationship that Brazilian migrants have with Ireland, a relationship which is clearly expressed in language: where Algerian migrants refer to France as a 'whore' (1999: 147), Brazilian migrants refer to Ireland as a 'mother', albeit a mother who seems to differentiate and gradate her children according to the economic contributions that they are able to make.

Nevertheless, it is hard to ignore that in both cases migration is understood as problematic, and therefore in need of order. Sayad (1999) seems to place the power to order in the hands of nation-states, especially receiving countries, and to a large degree my own research pushes this same line of thinking. However, much more needs to be said about these relations of power such that one includes individual-level processes and the impact individuals have on changing and altering these relations and systems. I would therefore see migration as a process shaped by nation-states and as a personal and individual emancipatory project. Sayad notes that 'if we ignore the migratory phenomenon by ignoring part of it, as we usually do, there is a danger that we will constitute the population of immigrants as a purely abstract category, and the immigrant as a pure artefact' (1999: 178). I take the personal, intimate, palpable and transcendent experiences of migrants to be an integral part of the migratory phenomenon as well, and argue that without a picture of these experiences we cannot shift our attention from the migrant to the person who happened to have migrated at some point, that is, it is through this shift that I hope to move beyond the migrant as citizen, to migrant as human being, capable of making individual decisions and finding solutions to address the uncertainties and ambivalences that migration inevitably creates.

Through an examination of relations of debt, kinship obligations, money, consumption, modernity, individual freedom, and melancholia which are prevalent matters in the lives of Brazilian migrants and their families, regardless of which country they live in, I aim to enquire into the everyday relations that migrants maintain with others and within which they constitute themselves, and attempt to contextualise these relations on the basis of the moral obligations that migrants sustain and forge with their kin in Brazil and in Ireland. Whilst the introduction of a wider availability of money may eventually afford a sense of individual freedom and autonomy by overcoming the constraints imposed by a salary in Brazil which does not allow for excess, money earned in Ireland also introduces new complexities to the moral commitments that migrants and non-migrants have to each other. In the light of this, migration to Ireland may enable a degree of individual freedom in economic terms and access to a world of consumption, but perhaps more importantly it offers the experience of an alternative form of modernity and the consideration of the possibility of a different kind of life. This possibility is already in itself a project of liberation, of considering what was once beyond reach; however, this possibility is nearly always articulated in the everyday in relation to the moral imperatives and commitments to kin in Brazil. These experiences frame and shape the migrant's return and must be understood as moments of disjuncture created by the experience of difference lived in Ireland and extended to Brazil upon return. It is in moments of disjuncture that life is lived, moments which are never marked by happiness or unhappiness, by a sense of individual freedom and the contradictions of kinship obligations, by a desire for consumption and a feeling of un-fulfilment. As Michael Jackson reminds us, anthropology can 'testify to the very diversity, ambiguity, and interconnectedness of experiences that abstract thought seeks to reduce, tease apart, regulate, and contain in the name of administrative order and control' (Jackson 2002: 253). And, it is the moments of disjuncture that Jackson finds

fecund in teasing out existential matters because, ‘what is at stake are those critical experiences, unfolding between what we take for granted and what we find we cannot control or comprehend’, and ‘what really matters’, he argues, ‘is not how we name them, but how we live through them’ (Jackson 2009: 101).

Like the Algerian migrants described by Sayad (1999), so too Brazilian migrants must constantly reinvest their new circumstances and lived experiences with meaning, and each movement to and from Ireland is infused with it so that this movement can be justified by the migrant and tolerated by others in Brazil. I hope this thesis may contribute to an understanding of migrants as individuals whose individual status must not be merely defined in relation to their experiences of migration, but as individual human beings capable of making decisions even if those decisions require an adjustment of the joint commitments that migrants and non-migrants have with each other, and a realignment of a sense of belonging which is no longer exclusive to Brazil or Ireland, but to both. In that sense, I would like to move from discussions of migration as rupture in community life and problem for national interests, as well as discussions which view the condition of the migrant as ‘doomed’ to oscillate between the present in receiving countries and the return to his or her country of origin, and propose instead that migrants find a way to live here and there, and mediate that relationship within the confines of the experiences of difference they had in Ireland and the well established kinship obligations and loyalties which they have to their kin in Brazil. I hope it becomes clear as the reader reads this thesis that I am not for a moment suggesting that these moments of disjunction are not painful or without a huge degree of suffering and loneliness, but I hope it is also clear that I aim to show that along with the suffering there are transformations that disrupt established social and cultural patterns and open a way for individual paths of emancipation. Although these experiences are not

determinate and coherent, they are already behaviours in formation, as Raymond Williams (1977) observes, and thus are, in my view, fully worthy of our attention.

Methodology and research questions

The initial and general goals of my research were to enquire broadly into the processes and the experiences of Brazilian migrants who, having migrated to Ireland from 1999 onwards, were either talking about, considering or effectively planning their return to the Brazilian town of Presidente Epitácio; as well as this, I aimed to contribute to a general understanding of return migration, the international systems involved, together with the lived experiences of reintegration in Brazil upon return. I intended to enquire into the role of sending and receiving countries, and to bring a transnational approach to the study of states which would enable me to think about transnational migration policies and processes of return and reintegration. An initial premise was my belief that state boundaries do not delimitate how the state is perceived by migrants but, instead, these boundaries are shaped, challenged and resisted by everyday practices. This belief stemmed from my own observations with Brazilian migrants during the course of fieldwork for my Masters thesis, and from my work with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) on a research project which aimed to understand the patterns underlying the return of Brazilian migrants with an irregular immigration status in Ireland to Brazil. As I worked on those two projects and reflected on the everyday experiences of Brazilian migrants to Ireland, it became increasingly apparent that although nation-states tend to evaluate migration processes as occurring on a scale between ‘success’ and ‘failure’, process and policies which are often influenced by supra-state like institutions such as the European Union, migrants tend to show a lack of engagement with state institutions and their lives have, quite often, a focus which is less orientated and dominated by state policies than by the ambiguities created by the

experiences of a certain kind of modernity in Ireland and kinship commitments in Brazil.

As I became interested in these ambiguities, I started to explore the formation and maintenance of social and family relationships, when such relations are underpinned by notions of duty and obligation. Questions emerged concerning the role of social and moral obligations in family networks, and the specific strategies developed to cope with the complex social reality after migration, and life upon return to Brazil. As my perspectives on return migration changed, so did the initial research question and ultimately this thesis hopes to provide an account of and a discussion of reciprocity and individual freedom, concepts which are of paramount importance in order to appreciate the sense of loss, hope and melancholia which are expressed in the day-to-day lives of Brazilian migrants and concepts that help us tease out key trends in the fabric of human sociality. Michael Jackson observes that human existence is to be found in the ‘struggle between contending forces and imperatives’ (2005: ix) and it is to these that I aim to attend here.

The development of the initial research questions evolved to respond to the observations of a three-year long period of fieldwork in Naas, Ireland, between 2009 and 2012 and an additional four months spent in Presidente Epitácio, in Brazil, between May and September 2011. The town of Naas, in county Kildare, was chosen largely because it hosted approximately 1,000 Brazilian migrants, including a combination of migrants with different immigration status, regular and irregular, and who were in the main from Presidente Epitácio, a town in the state of São Paulo, Brazil. Because most Brazilian migrants in Naas travelled from the same town in Brazil, it seemed essential to travel to Brazil and carry out fieldwork there as well. Therefore, the methodology used was multi-sited ethnography conducted both in Ireland and in Brazil, and fieldwork was largely based on participant-observation, or as it is more casually thought of as ‘hanging

around', and complemented by over 70 in-depth and semi-structured interviews with key informants.

Abdelmalek Sayad notes that:

Listening to the most intimate confidences of an interviewee is always an emotional business ... they are a mark of the extreme trust he [sic] eventually places in the interviewer, who is always asking questions, who is interested in everything, who is always poking into everyone's past and present, into both their manifest and obvious modes of behaviour, and the explanations for those modes of behaviour and their ultimate finality, which are all secret or latent. (1999: 158-159)

For the reasons that Sayad so eloquently describes above, precautions were taken to prevent the identification of the persons interviewed and quoted in this thesis. Angela Garcia (2010: 34) notes that writing ethnography requires careful writing, not only in terms of 'writing carefully' but also in the sense that writing is also about craft.

Remaining truthful to the words of so many Brazilian migrants and their relatives who took the time and had the patience to keep responding to my 'poking', and to their personal characteristics which as Sayad (1999: 319) suggests are essential to any understanding of discourse and behaviour, five different 'composite characters' have been rendered in this thesis: Lucas, Luis and Vitoria, Alice, and Raul. They do not speak about one person in particular but nevertheless remain truthful to a set of social and individual patterns, and through this I hope to make their voices audible but keep their personal identity absent and protected. At the heart of this form of ethnographic representation was my preoccupation to reveal biographical details without these details being traced to one person. The Brazilian population in Naas is relatively small and, adding to that, most Brazilians in Naas tend to come from the same town in Brazil. This presented a number of challenges when revealing biographical details. The options, as I felt it, were to either be very vague about these details and therefore lose the personal force imprinted in them, or use the richness of biographical detail and compromise anonymity. I should also note that because the Brazilian population in Ireland is

relatively small, migrants tend to either personally know other Brazilians in other towns, or know them indirectly through friends or relatives. In that sense, although my own research was conducted in Naas, Brazilians in other towns were aware of it, and therefore using a pseudonym for the town could have been a precaution but would not ultimately be of much use. In the light of this, I opted for keeping the original names of the towns where I carried out research, and opted for more untraditional safeguards of confidentiality. Considering that over 70 in-depth and semi-structured interviews were conducted, the criteria to relate these informants to five composite figures rests on particular socioeconomic and demographic patterns emerging from conversations and interviews. Therefore the characters are truthful to the informants as they are representative of a particular age and socioeconomic group, family situation, as well as time of arrival in Ireland. Beyond that, the direct quotations used are often thoughts that had been shared by most of the informants within that specific group but which I felt had been particularly well articulated by one particular person.

Finally, a word on the limits of ethnography and the ‘emotional business’ that Sayad refers to: reading the thesis I am conscious that so much more could be said, and it troubles me that I am not saying all that I could. I realise however that writing ethnography is a decision-making process, a process of selecting parts of a whole and, yet, making sense of the whole. Conducting fieldwork also means that we must attend to the relations between the subjects of our study and ourselves. Veena Das reminds us that it is through the relations we establish with others that we ‘learn about the nature of the world in the process of such living ... [and] we cannot assign scale to patterns of sociality independent of perspective’ (2007: 4). Without denying that, as Das so clearly states, the ‘question, then, is not that of part-whole relations but of establishing the horizon within which we may place the constituent objects of a description in their relation to each other and in relation to the eye with which they are seen’ (ibid.).

Viewed through my eyes, I sincerely hope I am being faithful to the ‘intimate confidences’ that so many migrants shared with me.

Furthermore, Nigel Rapport argues that we must find a way to incorporate introspection in anthropological studies so that we attend, contemplate, and explore the ‘complex singularity of human being distinct from proximal identifications and categorizations’ (2007: 269). Through introspection as a methodological approach, Rapport further argues we will be capable of opening avenues of enquire and access ‘concerning individual human capacities and conditions’ (2007: 257). By looking inside oneself, Rapport proposes, the ethnographer ‘espies the universally human’ (ibid.) and this process offers new possibilities of understanding the behaviours and actions which give life to human conduct and possibilities -- as Rapport averts, ‘the anthropologist introspects as his or her informants introspect’ (2007: 268). As soon as I returned from Brazil, and approaching the end of my fieldwork, I once again, recognised and realised the obvious, that ethnography requires a constant renegotiation of the ethnographer’s identity through a process of constant introspection, and that too is part and parcel of ethnographic writing. And, through this, as Veena Das so lucidly observes, ‘I allow the knowledge of the other to mark me’ (1998: 193). As a friend said to me in one of those moments of hard negotiations and introspection: ‘You know Diana, you can read all these books that tell you how to enter and do fieldwork, but none of them tells you how to leave it’.

Outline of Chapters

Chapter one examines migration policy which is often based on common-sense assumptions which constitute migrants on the basis of their perceived rootedness if ‘at home’, or uprootedness if away from ‘home’. In this sense, the disorderly movement of people is a threat to the national stability of borders and a potential cause of erosion of

the national cultural identity. However, increasingly, migrants reject the world map of fixed borders and maintain lives here and there. By so doing, they challenge many of these cultural and national common-sense assumptions, and create lives which are, unmistakably, in motion. Yet, return migration policy has been primarily focused on managing irregular migration and has only timidly asked why and in what circumstances migrants consider returning or re-emigrating, and pursues a form of analysis which consistently separates the personal and the social by consistently ignoring the complexities of cultural expression which take place in the everyday. I argue that emigration is multi-layered, and independent return is also multi-layered, as is the possibility of re-migration. In that sense, return fits into a wide range of possible decisions for migrants, and these decisions are constantly being negotiated and renegotiated in daily life. I suggest that the discussion of migration in general, and of Brazilian migrants to Naas in particular, must recognise a multitude of causes that initiate, prevent, and sustain the movement of Brazilian migrants from a small town in Brazil to Ireland. Hence, to understand the processes behind return, we must understand initial departure and life in Ireland, allowing for the analyses of the complexities and uncertainties of everyday life. The ethnographic material collected during fieldwork explores the migratory inward movement of Brazilian migrants from Presidente Epitácio to Naas which I divide into three distinct periods. Each period serves to illustrate the collective experiences that migrants have in Ireland and upon return, whilst at the same time go beyond universal and fixed collective representations of migrants, and see them for what they are: individuals making decisions on their own personal lives.

Chapter two explores the transformations that migration creates in the relationships between individuals, individuals and money and the objects of their desires. This chapter addresses these transformations and inquires into the relationships

that systems of exchange create and maintain in the lives of Brazilian migrants and in the lives of their kin in Brazil. In providing an analysis of the sociability of credit and debt, particular emphasis will be placed on the disruption of kinship relations, which as described by Marshall Sahlins (2008), are not necessarily genealogical or corporeal, but grow from a moral foundation of mutual aid and equality. As kinship is reworked organically, non-migrants and migrants adapt and readapt to the different social environments, and reciprocity is worked out within the gaps between the dictums of a new moral compass and the particular interests of the parties, which generates forms of discontent and requires the re-modelling of existing reciprocal relations. The act of migrating also requires a rethinking of the relationship that individuals have with money credit and money proper, as well as with the wider society. Money earned abroad frees migrants from many of their social obligations and from forms of reciprocity that largely dictate that their own interests should come second to the interests of the group. As such, money liberates and affords personal freedom but increases social distance. Furthermore, this chapter discusses what migrants call the 'economy of time'. The economy of time creates a new sequence of rhythms, which shorten the distance between the migrants' will and the ability to reach the objects of their desires, and creates a sense of evenness that overcomes the irregularities and anxieties of a life where money is less available. However, the economy of time comes at the expense of emotional distance, and in many respects these two elements confront the migrant upon their return to Brazil. The economy of time and the choices and the possibilities that it enables also crystallizes the relativity of money and the absoluteness of what was the essence of their lives before migration.

Chapter three discusses migrants' evaluations of their time in Ireland and offers an examination into what migration enabled them to do; it is also a reflection on the on-going implications that movements to Ireland have on their lives and on their return to

Brazil. These evaluations are always done on a personal level *vis-à-vis* the alternatives they had in Brazil and the costs paid by emigrating; they are also collective representations of time and person in relation to opportunity-costs derived from moving to Ireland and moving back to Brazil. The aim in this chapter is also to explore the responses that Brazilians give to the time 'gained' in Ireland, which can potentially translate into money through the process of migration, which coupled with a certain experience of modernity acquires temporal meaning. Brazilian migrants in Ireland have graduated rights, the degree of which is largely dependent on the timeframe of their arrival in the country. In Ireland, they encounter a version of Irishness which is not always in line with the modern project critically discussed by Irish scholars. But regardless of this, migrants want a piece of what they have experienced as modern, and part of it is access to a world where nearly everything can be bought and sold, from citizenship to shoes. This is not a rational decision or merely a compulsion to shop, but is, rather, a claim to a piece of happiness and equality largely achieved through consumption. However, economic freedom achieved in Ireland goes hand in hand with a decrease in mutual engagement with the world they used to know in Brazil. Hence, through the migratory process migrants experience the joys of excess and the seduction of wastage. Paradoxically, migrants become more aware of the anxieties surrounding their return to Brazil which become more real and less of a dream.

Chapter four offers insight into the moments of ambiguity that Brazilian migrants returning to Presidente Epitácio face upon their return to Brazil, moments which are marked by the coming to terms with an uncertainty about their place in the world, about what they are expected to be and who they see themselves as being. This chapter addresses these ambiguities and disconnections created by the boundaries imposed by the self and the contours of an ever changing social world. Here I explore

the notion of melancholia to capture these social transformations and the transformations of the self in the context of return migration.

Upon return, the melancholic, although functioning socially, sustains a conflicting relationship with the society from where he or she has withdrawn. The question, however, is that, all along, the ideal-loss of what Ireland represented was never something that could be lost because it never existed, at least not in a permanent state. Although the ideal as such was never real, return to Brazil makes that knowledge conscious and once the possibility of a different life is accepted as an unlikely possibility, the loss of the ideal triggers another kind of loss, the loss of desire.

Return demands re-ordering the social world, and the coming to terms with the out-of-placeness of one's behaviours, thoughts and actions; it requires dealing with the 'gestation of uncertainty', and requires the very personal and intimate challenge of dealing with the void created by the possibility of a different life. Upon return, migrants must reacquaint themselves with the 'appropriate' order of things, and reorient their lives away from those things which, although common sense and 'normal' in Ireland, are 'out of place' in Brazil. Re-ordering the world upon return requires understanding where one stands but also acceptance of a certain form of reality; it is already an attempt to unify experience. When the experiences do not blend in some form or another, remaining in Brazil becomes unbearable and return to Ireland is likely to occur.

In chapter five I argue that the condition of the migrant is not only social but is also deeply personal and intimate. Without considering any of these two conditions more relevant or pertinent than the other, I suggest that, through a discussion of cosmopolitanism and the experience of otherness, the migrant is transcendent, and it is within this quality of being an individual human being that he or she may find a place in the world, a place which is cosmopolitan, where one could live on their own terms even if these terms are in constant tension and are not always coherent. This tension

illustrates moments of uncertainty and transformation, but they are also moments of possibility.

This chapter argues that whilst migrants display cosmopolitanism through the experience of migration they also remain deeply committed to traditional kinship expectations and patterns of reciprocity. The limitations created by the tension of the two imprint a sense of uncertainty and doubt in everyday life, and finding a balance between expressing a cosmopolitan character and remaining loyal to the local is not only possible but essential to the mediation between 'who one used to be' and 'who one has become'. The cosmopolitan, even if an *unintended cosmopolitan*, as I propose, recognises that, at some level, individual freedom and social obligations are two sides of the same coin and aims to reconcile these two apparently contradictory notions through a degree of what Vered Amit (Amit and Rapport 2012) defines as joint commitment, belonging and forms of association.

CHAPTER 1

Three waves of Brazilian migration to Ireland:

Reflections on policies and persons

A few years ago, during an informal conversation whilst discussing return and reintegration of Brazilian migrants with a Brazilian official to Ireland, the official found it surprising that I would be interested in researching return migration, especially because, as the official quickly pointed out, once in Brazil ‘they’re at home, they’re our responsibility’, suggesting an unproblematic reinsertion into life ‘at home’. The statement suggests more than a mere responsibility advocated by governments to regulate and govern the lives of their citizens: it also reflects a way of understanding people, encapsulated into fixed forms of what they used to be, confined to forms of how and where they used to live, which ultimately determines that once migrants return to their country of origin they will naturally and seamlessly blend into the social and cultural fabric of everyday life. In this sense, return, similar to pre-migration, migration, and re-migration, all become parts of a series of discontinuous but fixed events, where public understandings of present experiences of social life are mirrored on fixed forms from the past.

This view of the world, where people are inherently constituted as either being ‘at home’ or away from it, a dichotomy which excludes any possibility of plurality, is at the heart of migration policy, wherein immigration and return migration are problematised or un-problematised depending on which side of the Atlantic policy is being drawn. The argument on both sides is, however, the same. Liisa Malkki (1992) explores the taken-for-granted assumptions which are at the heart of political discussions of identity and territory, and draws attention to the analytical consequences of understanding migrants on the basis of their perceived rootedness. She further notes that these taken-for-granted assumptions are not only territorializing but are also ‘deeply metaphysical’, and notes that botanical and kinship metaphors such as ‘rootedness’, ‘homeland’, ‘motherland’, ‘fatherland’ describing people’s affiliations to places saturate language and social policy, which suggest that each national territory is like a ‘grand

genealogical tree, rooted in the soil that nourishes it' (1992: 28), and to which a person is naturally and unquestionably attached to. The trees, in that sense, 'evoke both temporal continuity of essence and territorial rootedness' (ibid.). The nation and its people are seen to sustain a symbiotic relation, in which change threatens the stability of not only the person itself and their own sense of identity and place, but also threatens the whole eco-system; migrants, as branches who have been displaced and de-territorialized, pose a risk to this continuity.

At the centre of this line of thought, Malkki argues, is a 'sedentarism in our thinking' (1992: 31), which ascribes people to specific spatial partitions, and ascribe them to these territories as their natural place in the world. In fact, only a sedentary logic can justify the concept of fixed and rigid national borders. In this sense, the disorderly movement of people is a threat to the national stability of borders and a potential cause of erosion of the national cultural identity. Malkki further asserts that a consequence of understanding the world in these terms enables a vision of displacement as pathological, and 'leads us to define displacement not as a fact about sociopolitical context, but rather as an inner, pathological condition of the displaced' (1992: 33). In this, uprootedness comes to signal, as Malkki suggests, a 'loss of moral and, later, emotional bearing' (1992: 34), and the migrant comes to be cured, or to be in his or her rightful place, either by returning to their country of origin or by fully negating their previous roots and settling permanently in the receiving country and 'rooting' oneself there. However, increasingly, migrants reject the world map of fixed borders and maintain lives here and there, and integrate and make use of multiple identities (see Rouse 1991). By so doing, they challenge many of these cultural and national common-sense assumptions, and create lives which are, unmistakably, in motion.

In view of this, and as Abdelmalek Sayad suggests, it is only 'through the total reconstruction of emigrants' trajectories that we can understand the complete system of

determinations which, having acted prior to their emigration and continuing to act, in a modified form, has brought emigrants, in the process of emigration, to their current point of arrival' (1999: 29). By introducing 'complete trajectories', we are already 'breaking with an 'eternalized image of immigration' (ibid.). But, Sayad's analysis views the migrant as 'condemned to refer simultaneously to two societies, ... without noticing the contradiction, of combining the incompatible advantages of two conflicting choices' (1999: 58), and takes emigration to be a threat 'to the integrity and survival of both the group and the emigrant himself' (1999: 69). By questioning the validity of sedentarist perspectives which ascribe people to belonging either here or there, and as 'uprooted' in receiving countries and 'rooted' in countries of origin, we are already acknowledging that communities, groups and people are not static and are rather in a constant process of transformation which is not always delimited by the borders of the nation-state. In that sense, Sayad and I travel in different directions, yet the initial premise remains, that is, the process of migration must be discussed in the context of 'complete trajectories'.

This is not, however, to understate the role of borders and border regimes. Sarah Green (2013: 349) notes that an understanding of what constitutes a border can actually be a good starting point to inquire into people's perceptions of the relationships they forge with a place, and also to understand how place is defined and redefined. She further argues that although border studies have tended to focus on the effects of people moving across international borders or on the ways through which states assert their power to include or exclude people across those borders, Green calls for an examination of borders themselves and the ways in which they come to take shape and the resulting effects of that design and redesign. The current financial and ideological crises in the European Union and a potential Grexit, is a case in point which draws our attention to the complexity of border regimes and the anxieties they create because, as Green asserts

it ‘makes it difficult to say where Europe is located, even in geographical terms’ (2013: 346).

My own concern here is not so much with border regimes or borders and the ways migrants engage with them -- although I touch on this point in chapter three when I discuss marriages of convenience; rather, my attention is placed on the relationships that migrants create, maintain, alter, and rethink with themselves and others beyond national borders. Transnational migration is sometimes a controversial topic and one which has predominated in contemporary migration studies. As Glick Schiller, Basch, and Szanton Blanc (1995) have already argued, much in line with Malkki (1992), although ‘assumptions about the uprootedness of immigrants filtered the way in which immigrant history was recorded, interpreted, and remembered’ (51), a focus on transnationalism provides the ground to consider the fact that migrants ‘live their lives across national borders and respond to the constraints and demands of two or more states (54), because global landscapes do not rest anymore in the fixity of a single centre and peripheries, and must rather be understood as ‘a complex, overlapping, disjuncture order’ between economy, culture and politics (Appadurai 1990: 296). As such, transnational migrants are people who ‘move and build encapsulated cultural worlds around them’ (Werbner 1999: 19; Werbner 1990). But, as Ann Miles (2004) has also argued, we should not forget that at the heart of migration is the movement of individual people. Importantly, and I will return to this point later, for migrants, membership to one nation-state does not preclude membership from another (Adler 2000). Following that line of thought, what follows is primarily about people, but first a reminder of what is at the heart of policy.

Migration policy, at Irish national and European level, is often framed in sedentarist terms. Based on territoriality, migration policy tends to focus on channels of entry and eligibility of migrants to reside and work in the receiving country. Going from

this premise, migrants are defined by the state in economic and political terms, and are expected to either return to their country of origin or acquire permanent residency or citizenship. Jacques T. Godbout (1998) insightfully asserts that whilst the state and the market might represent focal points for ‘secondary sociality’ -- a kind of sociality which is defined primarily by institutional roles and functions, human beings must primarily be understood as persons before they are seen in terms of the economic, political, or administrative functions which they may come to fulfil. As such, he argues that persons must be understood:

Not just as a conglomerate collection of particular roles or functions but autonomous units endowed with at least a measure of coherence all their own. The transformation of biological individuals into social persons does not occur first in the relatively abstract sphere of the market and the state, even if they make a certain contribution, but in the world of primary sociality, where, within the family, in relations with neighbours, in comradeship, person-to-person relationships are forged.’ (Godbout 1998: 10)

However, return migration policy is often the result of a form of analysis which consistently separates the personal and the social, and consistently ignores the complexities of cultural expression which take place in the everyday. The document Return Migration produced by the European Migration Network broadly defines return as:

Any action that facilitates the passage of a non-EU/EEA (i.e. third country) national migrant to their country of origin or another country outside the EU. ... [The] study addresses the two main types of return actions, namely Voluntary¹ and Forced. (European Commission 2007: 4)

The report further suggests that although an effective return migration policy is an important aim in the European context, there is however ‘no clear boundary between Voluntary and Forced Return, since there are different understandings of these terms by the Member States and it sometimes depends on the legal status of a returnee (legal or

¹ In the Irish case, similar to other EU Member States, ‘Voluntary Return’ refers to Voluntary Assisted Return programmes, often funded by national governments to ‘assist’ asylum seekers whose asylum claim was unsuccessful, and irregular migrants. Often, Voluntary Assisted Return is taken as an alternative to deportation or forced return by national authorities. See http://publications.iom.int/bookstore/free/avrr_in_the_eu.pdf

illegal resident)' (ibid.). Nevertheless, return migration is primarily and fundamentally defined in the realm of the actions taken by individual Member States to address migration management, mainly through (Assisted) Voluntary Return and Forced Return. Voluntary return, that is, the independent act of voluntarily returning to one's country of origin, not to be confused with Assisted Voluntary Return which is often worded in policy as simply 'Voluntary Return', is usually absent from policy documents and understood as a personal choice, thus falling outside return migration policy aims. With voluntary return generally absent from migration policy, return and readmission are grouped together and problematised in the document, "The Global Approach to Migration one year on: Towards a comprehensive European migration policy" under the heading, 'Fighting illegal migration and trafficking in human beings' (Commission of the European Communities 2006:8). Following the same line of thought, the "Framework programme on solidarity and management of migration flows for the period 2007-2013" (European Union 2008) outlines the establishment of a financial 'solidarity mechanism' intended to cover a number of areas. One of those areas is the setting up of a European Return Fund, with the aim to 'fight against illegal immigration and the return of Non-EU Member Country nationals residing illegally in the EU'². Return is then problematised as something to be managed, mainly through Forced Return or (Assisted) Voluntary Return. As noted by Caroline Brettell, 'migrants are change agents, but not always in ways that are hoped for by those who want to link migration with development as part of the larger project of managing migration' (2007: 56). Return migration policy has been primarily focused on managing irregular migration and has only timidly asked why and in what circumstances migrants consider returning or re-emigrating, as well as the reasons that lead migrants to remain in the receiving country or to consider other options.

² http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/justice_freedom_security/free_movement_of_persons_asylum_immigration/114509_en.htm

Voluntary return migration is nearly an afterthought of migration policy, and independent return is only briefly mentioned in a footnote on the section ‘Circular Migration and Brain Circulation’, where it is stated that:

The meaning of the term ‘return’ is understood to be a broad one, which is not limited to repatriations in the context of illegal immigration. In most cases, it actually refers to the process of voluntarily going back to one’s country of origin. (Commission of the European Communities 2005: 7)

This suggests that its common understanding is, in fact, other than voluntary and independent return. The general change, as opposed to deliberate change in migrants’ lives, their lived and present experience, is often absent from policy and political debate. Once voluntary, return becomes personal, and only relevant for policy *vis-à-vis* its contribution to economic development. The same document takes remittances to denote, ‘all financial transfers from migrants to beneficiaries in their countries of origin’ (Commission of the European Communities 2005: 3) and imagines remittances as a step for improving the impact of migration on development. However, it fails to include what Peggy Levitt calls ‘social remittances’, that is, ‘the ideas, behaviours, and social capital that flow from receiving to sending-country communities’ (1998: 927). One type of social remittances which is of particular importance for Brazilian migrants upon return to Brazil are normative structures (see Levitt 1998: 933), which include ideas and notions about public behaviour and aspirations to social mobility, by which they have been highly influenced during the time they spent in Ireland. Although migrants speak about notions of honesty, tidiness, social equality and public order, these notions are slippery and while they may constitute a bonding mechanism between some migrants and non-migrants, they may also constitute sources of isolation and alienation when they are not taken up by other people. These experiences are not deliberate choices made by migrants to carry or transfer ‘home’, they are behaviours in formation, as Raymond Williams (1977) suggests, rather than finished experiences that can be

rationalised, and for this reason they create a discomfort within policy and, as a result, are often ignored. In that regard, current return migration policy is devoid of any affective notions and any present experience, which is already, in itself, social.

If we only account for a world-view where individuals and families seek to achieve in economic terms what would be unimaginable to achieve in their country of origin, it is tempting to consider migrants making rational cost-benefit decisions about the prospects of emigrating. At the core of neoclassical theories is precisely the assumption that migrants move internationally for income maximisation and search for the country that best responds to their income ambitions (see Borjas 1989). Ostensibly, this is only limited by the migrant's financial resources and by the legal constraints in the receiving country. This theory also suggests the existence of an 'immigration market' guided by market principles and subject to changes in the economic activity in both sending and receiving countries.

Equally, it would be too easy to suggest that the arrival of Brazilian migrants in Naas to work in the meat industry was a clear response to pull-factors in the Irish economy and by Irish companies, especially if we consider that in the late 1990s and early 2000s Ireland was in the midst of an economic boom, with a market in urgent demand for labour. Irish migration policy falls somewhere in between these two approaches. *Migration Policy*, a policy document on Irish migration, identifies the causes of immigration to Ireland during this time largely based on push-pull factors (see National Economic & Social Development Office 2006: 30), but also notes the income differential between sending countries and Ireland, and the effects of income maximization for migrants (see National Economic & Social Development Office 2006: 27).

One of the difficulties with this approach to understanding migration to Ireland is the fact that it presumes that migrants search, compare and choose where and when

they want to migrate. It also presumes a pre-existing will from the migrant to actively emigrate and part-take in the 'immigration market'. But even if such market exists, it does not necessarily mean that everyone wants to actively be a part of it -- in the same way, the existence of a housing market does not necessarily mean that everyone wants to buy a house as the decision depends on a number of circumstances not all resting on financial resources or market conditions. Voluntary return, and more broadly migration, tends to be thought of in policy around the same terms, as a rational, measured decision, and tends to, as Sayad notes, use the 'language of economics to rationalize a problem that is not (or not only) economic' (1999: 77) and through this it converts 'ethical or political arguments into purely technical arguments' (ibid.). Yet, emigration is multi-layered, and independent return is also multi-layered, as is the possibility of re-migration. As noted by Markowitz and Stefansson, 'there is no singular process of return: the processes of homecoming are characterized by considerable complexity and ambivalence that provide rich examples of cultural creativity and inventiveness' (cited in Brettell 2007: 56-57), a point that Olsson (2004) also makes when he alerts for the dangers of the use of the word 'return' which often triggers associations to an 'event'. As we start enquiring into these complexities the closer we come, as Sayad notes, 'to factors that are overlooked by economic techniques because they are resistant to (quantitative) 'measurement'' (1999: 80) and so, he continues, 'it becomes increasingly apparent that the facts we are analysing and interpreting as purely economic data are also, and perhaps primarily, political, social and cultural facts and realities' (ibid).

Return fits into a wide range of possible decisions for migrants, and these decisions are constantly being negotiated and renegotiated in daily life. Byron and Condon find problematic the notion that the outcome of migration tends to fall into either permanent return or permanent settlement, and that implicit in the migration process is the notion 'that a permanent return at some stage is the necessary completion

step in the process' (1996: 91), and, through this, the migrant finally returns to his or her 'roots'. This dichotomy is present in Irish policy documents where on the one hand it is presumed that some migrants will return to their country of origin, and others will permanently settle in Ireland and will apply for Irish citizenship (see National Economic & Social Development Office 2006) which 'grounds' them in their new adoptive country; research tells us otherwise. Roger Rouse (1991) draws attention to the inadequacy of thinking about migration as a movement between sending and receiving countries, and suggests that migrants orchestrate their lives in complex circuits not exclusively tied to one or another national border. In that sense, return does not always mean permanent return, and citizenship is not always sufficient to tie the migrant down to one particular country.

What seems to be a recurrent theme in return migration studies though is the fact that return is underpinned by ambivalence, and it is never, even when the result of a conscious, rational, and voluntary decision, unproblematic. In some cases, this ambivalence rests on two tensions: the moral impetus to fulfil individual desires and the obligations towards kin. As such, return responds to conflicting desires to respond to kinship-based morality and personal ambitions of autonomy and consumption which give rise to the construction of 'two potential selves' as Mary Beth Mills argues (1997: 37), in conflict with one another. Mills explores consumption practices as a gendered issue for young women in rural Thailand who emigrate to Bangkok, and who, through these practices, contest marginalization and construct new identities but who are also torn between their own desires for autonomy and their familial obligations.

Through internal or international migration, new consumption practices are brought about by the experiences of migration and the construction of ideas of modernity, and so return is often accompanied by the fear of social and economic regression (Mills 1997; Martes 2000; Tsuda 2003; Torresan 2012) and the loss of social

status acquired through the gifting of imported commodities (Gardner 1993; Torresan 2012). Importantly, as Gardner (1993) shows this is a fear shared by non-migrants, as well as by migrants since their financial stability might depend of regular remittances.

Therefore, return migration is contemplated in a scenario where kinship expectations and obligations are balanced with individual desires and ambitions (Mills 1997; Salih 2001), as well as negotiated within the context of power relations between younger and older generations (Traphagan 2000). Return is also considered beyond economic and consumption realities, and cultural values associated with ‘respect’ considerably contribute to the decision to return. Martes (2000) for example notes how young Brazilian migrants in the United States feel more respected there than in Brazil, even though they are undocumented and may take up menial jobs. In this case, the values attributed to ‘respect’ greatly influence the prospects of return and settlement in Brazil.

Tsuda (2003) shows that in the case of Japanese Brazilians who return to Japan, return is driven by both economic imperatives and a desire to return to the ‘ancestral’ homeland of their parents and grand-parents. In this case, return presents a whole different set of difficulties especially when Japanese Brazilians are confronted with the experience of ethnic discrimination in Japan, which paradoxically leads them to develop a much stronger sense of belonging towards Brazil. As such, return is full of ‘contradictory longings’ (Ramji 2006: 647), and balances itself in the tension created by the ‘desired’ and the ‘lived’ (Ramji 2006), and in those moments when the migrant is at ‘home’ and simultaneously feels like a stranger, and alienated from both countries (Olsson 2008).

Although some scholars find an affinity between internal or transnational return, and diasporic return, there are however some differences which are only briefly mentioned here. One of these differences, according to Olsson and King, ‘is to be found

in how the very notion of home is perceived. In a diasporic setting the ancestral home(land) is often constructed as something sacred and desirable but also symbolic - mythical even - and thus to an extent unknown' (2008: 257). In many cases, nostalgia of a return to the ancestral homeland translates into a desire to relocate to a place where they belong (Tsuda 2003; Olsson & King 2008; Erciyas 2008; Sardinha 2008; Hess 2008), and yet it is not uncommon for this desire to be frustrated by the experiences of reintegration upon return which, in some cases, leads to re-migration. Another important difference between the return of transnational migrants and the return migration projects of diasporics is the fact that for the diaspora, Olsson (2008) argues, return is understood as a 'programmed act' (362). In the case of the Chilean diaspora who had lived in Sweden as political exiles, return is a complex net of collective rather than individual decisions precisely because return resonates with a wider 'practice and discourses that operate in the migrants' social context' (364). However, many of the experiences enunciated within the process of return migration by the diaspora do resonate with the experience of return of transnational migrants -- experiences of return are often framed with the language of disappointment and frustration, and tend to conclude that migrants feel dislocated from both (or more) countries.

I take a more positive view of return in the sense that I suggest that, in some cases, migrants feel that they actually belong to both places. Ultimately, and as recent studies on migration and cosmopolitanism show (Hall 2014; Grønseth 2014) migrants find ways to recognise themselves in others, and to recognise others in themselves. As Pnina Werbner notes, transnationals who 'familiarise themselves with other cultures and know how move easily between cultures' (1999: 20) are not only transnationals but they are also cosmopolitans. I return to this topic in chapter five.

But for now, I would like to suggest that the discussion of migration in general, and of Brazilian migrants to Naas in particular, must recognise a multitude of causes

that initiate, prevent, and sustain the movement of Brazilian migrants from a small town in Brazil to Ireland. There is nothing dramatically new in this, though. Tsuda (2003) in his discussion of migration of Japanese Brazilians to Japan shows that although economic factors play a part in the migration process, travelling to Japan is not a rational choice but is rather a choice made on the basis of ethnic identity with the 'land' of their ancestors. Angela Torresan (2012) shows that middle-class Brazilian migrants in Portugal emigrated not only for economic reasons but migration was also a kind of political act, a consequence of the alienation felt after numerous promises of economic success and modernity were undelivered by successive Brazilian governments.

Massey et al. (2002) have already proposed that a conceptualisation of international migration policies should recognise and act on the multi-causal nature of migration itself, which on the other hand requires an understanding of the motivations and interests behind the different actors in sending and receiving societies (see Werbner 1990; Castles and Miler 1993). To this, however, I would add that it is this multi-causal nature of migration, and motivations and interests in sending and receiving societies which absolutely frame and influence the relationship that the migrant is constantly forging with the host country and with his country of origin. Therefore, to understand the processes behind return, we must understand initial departure and life in Ireland, allowing for analyses of the complexities and uncertainties of everyday life.

In the Irish case, arguably the vast majority of research conducted with Brazilian migrants in Ireland has been with Brazilians who settled in Gort, Co. Galway (see Healy 2006; Sheringham 2009; McGrath and Murray 2009; McGrath 2010). Brazilians in Gort, and to a lesser extent in Roscommon, have also been the subject of television programmes such as *No Place Like Home* (2005), *Little Brazil* (2006), and *The New Irish After the Bust* (2012). In these programmes, Brazilians in Gort, and by extension Brazilians in Ireland, are portrayed as examples of successful integration, and Ireland as

a dreamland where dreams can come true. Such programmes draw a picture of a highly visible population (cf. Margolis 1994; Martes 2000) and, as the vast majority of migrants in Gort were previously unemployed in Brazil, a population who are ultimately grateful to Ireland for providing them with highly-paid jobs when compared with their country of origin. These documentaries are aimed at mainstream audiences, and media responses to migration suggest a preoccupation with the portrait of the Brazilian population in Ireland as integrable, homogeneous, and poor, always grateful to Ireland for harbouring and nurturing their dreams of a life out of poverty. Editorial approaches soothe potential anxieties about the emergence of foreign populations in Ireland and as suggested by Titley et al., ‘a focus on personalities, experiences, emotions and human stories is now regarded as the fundamental basis on which cross-cultural programming can be developed’ (2010: 50). In doing so, multicultural programming neglect a discussion and analysis of underlying immigration and integration policies, and often, if not always, ignore the legal framework and requirements that migrants have to fulfil in order to legally live and work in Ireland. Such approaches romanticise migration and Brazilian migrants, and ignore the layers of daily anxiety in migrants’ lives caused by such policies, ignore the role of the Irish state as the creator and enforcer of such policies, and ‘at a formal level, it could be argued that the individual story works precisely by limiting or occluding the wider context’ (Titley et al. 2010: 50).

Whilst some of the experiences of social and ‘civil-integration’ (Vertovec cited in Sheringham 2009) of Brazilians in Gort resonate with the experiences of migrants in Naas, wherein interaction with Irish society is restricted to contacts at work and to day-to-day activities (Sheringham 2009), a considerable difference is the perception, as noted by Olivia Sheringham, that local authorities ‘turn a ‘blind eye’ to immigration status, a factor which undoubtedly attracts Brazilians to Gort and contributes to their sense of security in the town’ (Sheringham 2009; see also McGrath 2010). This is not

the general perception of Brazilian migrants in Naas. In fact, the legality of the migrant's status is a hidden subject kept behind closed doors, and very present in everyday life. This is particularly relevant because contrary to what is known from migrants in Gort, the vast majority of migrants in Naas were either employed or studying in Brazil before emigrating. This conditioned their willingness to live in Ireland as irregular migrants, and those who became irregular migrants in Ireland speak very negatively about their experiences which ultimately, they suggest, conditions their return to Brazil. Whilst some migrants speak about the leniency of the local police authorities in Naas, an important part of daily life is precisely to overcome state restrictions to work and to live in Ireland. In that sense, personal needs, such as acquiring a work permit or an authorisation to live in Ireland, are dealt with within the close-knit world of the family unit. Importantly, what this tells us is that, generally, Brazilian migrants in Naas fall outside the remit of return migration policy, and their collective experiences are deemed unimportant and fixed in the past.

I should note that I am not defending a more interventionist migration policy. But I am suggesting that migration policy as it is currently thought of and designed ignores fundamental aspects of migrants' lives, and sees migrants in terms of abstractions based on past experiences. By ignoring present experience and by failing to include affective notions, migrants are often portrayed in policy as economic beings, *homo economicus*, making deliberate and rational choices, and following the principles of international labour demand. This analysis fails to include the complexities and uncertainties of everyday life, with the consequence that such policies are always, in their very nature, reactive. Furthermore, such policies dismiss the fact that migrants have the capacity and the power to make their own choices and that 'neither laws nor the economy can determine the options they make' (Adler 2000: 166). Hence, we must attend to the emotional and cultural realities which are produced in daily life and which

escape, quite often, quantification and measurement. Clifford Geertz proposes that going beyond such abstractions arising from qualitative styles of reasoning is in fact core to the activity that is ethnographic research: the effort to gain ‘access to the conceptual world in which our subjects live so that we can, in some extended sense of the term, converse with them’ (2000: 24). But migration policy, and by extension return policy, as it is currently drawn, is not interested in conversations or in accessing a world where migrants live, with all its layers, but is rather cemented on economic and territorial principles which ignore present experience.

Anthropology involves a commitment to study actually lived lives that often confound abstract theories about measurable individual behaviour, theories favoured by economists and, more often than not, by states concerned with the governmental management of migration (Graeber 2001: 5ff). In that sense, anthropology can speak to and inform policy by giving priority, or at least, an equal place to the study of the social, cultural and kinship ties which create and sustain migratory movements. Moreover, the role of anthropology is to make sense of the migrant’s everyday processes, and the reasons that are likely to influence their decisions to migrate which are often voided of their fluidity when transposed into static and fixed policies.

As such, anthropology can, and in my view should, build bridges between policy knowledge and qualitative knowledge. This could provide the ground for a reworking of the ‘sedentarism in our thinking’ which Malkki (1992) so clearly explores, as well as a shift from models which ignore everyday forms of experience. Thus, Pierre Bourdieu warns against the dangers of considering common-sense dominant world-views which produce taken-for-granted practices by falling into one of both extremes: ‘language of consciousness’ and the ‘language of the mechanical model’ (1990: 80), and thus we must see to the practices which are produced in the everyday, since the latter fails to consider the objectifying act and so the observer fails to see the urgency, which for

Bourdieu is one of the essential properties of practice, and fails to consider ‘the threats, the steps to be taken, which make up the real, really lived-in, world’ (1990: 82). For this reason, the observer cannot give a scientific account of practice ‘unless one is aware of the effects that scientific practice produces by mere totalization’ (Bourdieu 1990: 92). As for the former, actions are rationally, assessed and harmonised without reference to collective dispositions. Hence, the idea of practical logic excludes attention to itself and is ‘caught up in the ‘matter in hand’, totally present in the present and in the practical functions that it finds there in the form of objective potentialities’ (Bourdieu 1990: 94). Thus, Bourdieu argues, one has to move from ‘objects or actions to the principle of their production’ (ibid.), so that:

One sees both the ordinary error and their basis in an object which, like rite or myth, lends itself, by its very ambiguity, to the most contradictory readings. On the one hand, there is the lofty distance which objectivist hermeneutics seeks to keep between itself and elementary forms of thought ... On the other hand, there is the exalted participation and de-realizing enchantment of the great initiates of the Gnostic tradition, who make common sense function as lived meaning. (1990: 96)

Raymond Williams (1977) had already argued in his essay “Structures of Feeling” that one of the basic mistakes in social analysis is its reduction to fixed and past events, to what is explicit, fixed and can consequently be explained and theorised. This inevitably creates a gap between what remains in the past and what is presently being lived, and present experience is then better defined as personal, inscribed with a certain fragility and vulnerability which cannot be explicitly described. The reduction of social experience to fixed and past forms, ignoring the complexities, doubts and anxieties of present living, ultimately are ‘against social analysis itself’ (1977: 129-30), and transforms migrants into fixed subjects in a permanent state of social fixity. Williams suggests that these personal and present experiences with all their complexities and uncertainties, without clear and explicit boundaries capable of being articulated in political and social discourse, are already in themselves social. Hence,

Williams proposes that ‘structures of feeling’ is a cultural hypothesis, ‘social experience in solution’ (1977: 133), a particular quality of social life awaiting definition. It is often the living present, the ability to live-on through experiences of vital importance, that may include ruptures and disjunctures, which is of significance in ethnographic research. And what is important, as Michael Jackson reminds us, ‘is not how we name them, but how we live through them’ (2009: 101). William Mazzarella argues that, ‘the senses, like the self, have their histories’ (2009: 293), and when these histories are excluded from public debate we are left with a migration policy which excludes from its formulation the very people it aims to manage. The exclusion of affective notions from policy making means that migration policy must confront the very real possibility of inefficiency. I should clarify that when I speak about migration I understand it to be a continuum of interlinked moments, from pre-migration to potential re-emigration, which requires the analysis of affect and reason in all their complexities. As we must start somewhere, let us start at the beginning.

Contrary to conventional wisdom, it is not the poorest of the poor who emigrate (Massey et al. 1998) and, as is the case of Brazilian migrants in Naas, it is those who quite often live in dynamic countries undergoing rapid economic development (Massey et al. 2002: 156), and who have the social and the financial capital to do so, as well as the supportive networks which are instrumental in maintaining transnational links (Glick Schiller, Basch, and Szanton Blanc 1995: 54; Castles and Miller 1998: 26). Migrant flows often consist of better-educated individuals of higher socioeconomic status rather than the act of the economically dispossessed. Tsuda (2003: 89) reports that by 1996 there were 1.56 million Brazilian migrants living outside Brazil and that ‘many of these are middle class and relatively well educated, but perform low-status, unskilled jobs in their host countries that are shunned by native workers’ (see also Margolis 1994; Torresan 1994; Martes 2000; Beserra 2003; cf. Torresan 2012).

However, and although many Brazilian migrants in Naas do not consider themselves middle-class, they have nevertheless indicated that they were employed in Brazil and that they had not contemplated emigrating before, thus they were far from the conventional perception that, as one migrant put it, ‘the Irish thought we were all miserable [poor]’ (Interview, June 2011). Furthermore, many took up similar jobs in the meat factory in Naas to the ones they had in Brazil. In that sense, emigrating was almost never a case of escaping poverty but rather an opportunity of life which only became fully transparent when friends who had emigrated to Ireland returned a year later on holidays and bought their first property in cash, usually a plot of land, and who had in the meantime settled their accounts. As others consider the possibility of migration, the movement of Brazilian migrants from Presidente Epitácio to Naas was to be influenced by political and social transformations, which framed their lives in Ireland and also their potential return to Brazil.

I view the migratory inward movement of Brazilian migrants from Presidente Epitácio to Naas divided into three distinct periods. Each period illustrates precisely the above premise, that is, that most of those who emigrated did not consider themselves as the poorest of the poor, they tended to be employed in Brazil and saw the possibility of emigrating as an opportunity to ‘progress’ in socio-economic terms. Secondly, emigrating required having the resources and the networks which enabled migrants to seize that opportunity. The first wave, between 1998 and early 2001, was characterised by the arrival of migrants, mainly male, who had been directly recruited in Presidente Epitácio by Irish employers, mainly from Queally Group, to work in Naas as, mainly, Meat Boners. The second wave, which I identify as taking place between mid-2001 until 2003, is marked by the migration of male and female, to work as Meat Boners and *faqueiras*, but not exclusively, and who were recruited mainly by close relatives who were already in Ireland. Persons migrating during both these periods entered Ireland on

valid work-permits valid for one year easily renewed by the company thereafter. I identify the third wave as the period from 2003 onwards. This period is identifiable by two parallel but distinct movements: (1) of mainly dependants of migrants who had emigrated during the first and the second wave, and who are entitled to reside in Ireland although not always to work; and (2) adult children and close relatives of previous migrants who entered Ireland as a tourist and overstayed their visa, and to a lesser extent others who entered on a student visa. Although these two groups of people have different residence and work entitlements, most of them end up working in the informal economy.

First wave - Living in a crowded *república*

As we sat to have coffee in an old church which had been converted into a trendy Dublin bar, Lucas said that he had never been out for coffee in Ireland. He had been in the country for nearly five years and for the most part of that time, he worked, slept and ate, and kept his focus on what was ‘important’, that is, making as much money in Ireland so he could go back to Brazil and join his family and kin, as soon as possible. He was a young man in his late twenties, tall and athletic, features which clashed with his soft-spoken manners and the gentleness and measured movements with which he stirred his cappuccino. As we sat across each other, Lucas looked at me and told me he was ready for the ‘questions’. We had met many times before but this time we were having a formal interview, one of the reasons why we were not meeting at his house which he shared with other Brazilians. This conversation required some privacy and some quietness which are two difficult things to achieve in *república* houses, ‘I say we live in *república* [republic], as I still live today, because everyone has rights here ... we buy food together, we eat together’ (Interview May 2011). And equally, everyone has

the same entitlement to shared spaces such as the sitting-room and the kitchen which leaves the bedroom as the only truly private place in the house.

I asked him to tell me about himself and Lucas started in his childhood. His father had a little home-based business, making *linguiça*, a type of meat sausage. The whole family helped, even Lucas who started when he was only six-years-old. The house was always full of neighbouring children who would come to help and play, but whilst the other children were free to go when they got tired of the game of making *linguiça* and left to play soccer, Lucas had no such an alternative. Helping out was not optional and was not something to be questioned, but rather it was an integral part of being a family. Everything was going reasonably fine with the *linguiça* business except for the fact that it was illegal, and when the police found out the family had to stop. Lucas's father then started making ice-cream and the children would sell it door-to-door. Lucas does not complain about what he believes is a childhood without much 'hood' in it, but speaks of that time with a sense of inevitability, and immediately says, 'I have always been very grateful to God for my family' (Interview, February 2006), because Lucas knows that his life is not that different from so many other children in Brazil who are even excused from the first fifteen minutes of class in the morning if they are known to the teacher to work. When Lucas turned eighteen, he started working in the local meat factory plant during the week and held another part-time job during weekends, 'Sometimes,' he says, 'I would go from one job to the other without any sleep'.

Like many of his contemporaries, Lucas gave all of his income to his mother to help with the running of the house, only keeping the income from his weekend job for his own personal expenses. By the age of twenty-three, he had spent most of his life working and had already been promoted to work in the meat production line. Then, the

opportunity to come to Ireland arose during the first wave of Brazilian migration to Naas.

The first wave of Brazilian migrants to Naas were directly recruited in Brazil between 1998 and early 2001, when a visit by an Irish buyer from Ireland to the meat factory in Presidente Epitácio induced the emigration from that town to mainly Naas, Co. Kildare and to a lesser extent, Ballyjamesduff, Co. Cavan. Lucas had been in Ireland since 2000 and was one of the first men to come to Naas to work as a Meat Boner in the meat factory. Meat Boners, who at the time worked in the meat plant in Presidente Epitácio remember that the Irish buyers who came from Naas were impressed with the speed and efficiency of their work, and the 'Irish' immediately started making arrangements to bring some of those professionals to Ireland. Lucas recounts,

I came in a group of 14 people, ... but it was like this, people were coming at different stages. I came in the third group. ... There were 10 people in the first group, I think, if I'm not mistaken, then there were 12, then there was my group with 14, then in the next group there were 18, and so on so forth, ... always increasing. So, ... until the fifth group, everyone was hired by the company. (Interview, March 2011)

Most of them knew each other from working in the meat factory in Presidente Epitácio, or at least were acquainted with each other or had a friend in common. Queally Group in Naas, the parent company of Dawn Farms, IMI and until recently QK Meats, continued to make job offers under the same conditions during 1999 and 2000 and many Brazilians remember the meetings and job interviews hosted in Presidente Epitácio conducted by agents of the employer company in local clubs. Lucas remembers the first group recruitment sessions in Presidente Epitácio at the beginning of 2000, sessions which involved a practical demonstration of skill, and the frenzy that such meetings created in the town: photographers and shops where documents could be photocopied would open late to accommodate people who were applying for jobs in

Ireland -- at this stage some migrants had already been in Ireland for a year and had returned on holidays. Some, like Lucas, were then offered a one-year contract in Ireland, a place not many knew and even fewer thought of one day knowing. Lucas emigrated a few weeks after those meetings, others after a few months, some are still patiently waiting.

The departure of skilled Meat Boners from Presidente Epitácio had a considerable impact on the local labour force. Lucas's former team leader remembers that at the time, in 1999 and 2000, this increase in the departure of specialised workers had serious consequences for the team he supervised, as illustrated here:

The good professionals, they all went to Ireland. What happened was ... say that you have an amount of people [working] in production, 5 leave ... so ... I started hiring assistants ... training them, ... so I would have someone to cover for those leaving. But then those assistants, when they were trained, they would then do the test and go to Ireland, so it's like ... the Irish had a training school here to send people to Ireland. (Interview, July 2011)

In the light of these developments, the company in Brazil could not do much apart from continuing their investment training of Meat Boners. Finding potential workers was not, however, particularly difficult especially in a town where 40% of the working population is either unemployed or is only working sporadically in the informal economy (see Santos and Leal 2010: 6).

When Lucas first pondered the possibility of emigrating, he was single and had nothing to lose by emigrating, he had never thought about it, mainly because it had never been a possibility, life had been written and leaving his hometown was not, as Lucas could tell, in the script. As he puts it, 'You must understand that in Brazil, only middle and upper class people could afford to go abroad' (Interview, May 2011), something well beyond his ambitions. Despite this, when the owners of Irish meat factories started recruiting Meat Boners in Presidente Epitácio, Lucas thought that perhaps he could give it a go at writing a chapter in his own life and applied for a job

which would eventually bring him to Naas. Travelling abroad to work in Ireland was unproblematic as the employer in Ireland arranged for work contracts and work permits to be issued, and travel and housing arrangements had been made for the employees.

During this first wave of Brazilian migration to Naas, work permits were requested by and issued to the employer, and migrant workers usually travelled through Paris where they were met by a representative of the company who would then give them their work permits so they could enter Ireland. Like his colleagues, Lucas left Brazil with the guarantee of a work contract and the expectation of sending remittances to his family. Upon arrival in Ireland, he also discovered that:

Everything was sorted for us, house to live in, the first 3 months we had no expenses with food, they gave it to us, right? they gave us money in São Paulo ... so we had something to spend during the first week, so we wouldn't arrive without any money, we had everything, they would drive you to the company, bring you back, not all the time, but like, when you needed to do something like documentation ... they would take you to the immigration [office], to the Garda ... they would bring you there and bring you back, if you wanted to travel to Brazil they would buy the tickets for us and then they deducted it from our payslip, ... we didn't have to worry about anything, only with work ... at the time we even had an interpreter in the company. (Interview, July 2011)

Whilst literature suggests that existing migrants' ties lower the costs of international movement for future migrants (see Massey and España 1987), this does not seem to be the case for Brazilian migrants to Naas arriving from Presidente Epitácio during this first wave of migration. In fact, the cost of migration for the first wave of Brazilian migrants was considerably lower than for those who followed in their footsteps. Those travelling during this period did not have to make a considerable financial investment as arrangements such as flights, housing, food supplies, pocket money, etc. was initially supplied by the employer even if it would later be deducted from the employee's payslip. As financial and social capital increased, subsequent movements were only possible through an accumulation of such capital and experience.

Most speak about these first moments in Ireland in very grateful terms, which echoes the image of the ‘poor and grateful migrant’ portrayed in media outlets. However, if one continues to listen it becomes apparent that gratefulness attaches itself to limitations. After some time had passed, Lucas found that his actions were somewhat restricted by the links to the company, so he decided to search for private accommodation which he would still share with others, and move out of the house organised by the company. Lucas recalls:

We lived in *república* [republic] ... but before was very saturated with people, there were 6, 7, 8 people living here because before there were mainly men, the majority of us were all single, well, those who had families their wives were in Brazil ... as time went by we realised that it was easy to look for a house to share amongst ourselves, because the house from the company ... say that we were out of oil in the house, we had to ring the company [employer], then the company, “Oh, I’ll send someone tomorrow”, then they would postpone 1 week, 2 weeks and in the meantime we were living in the cold, and we kept paying the same amount, do you understand? ... Everyone decided to leave the houses from the company ... and become more independent. (Interview, May 2011)

Most migrants decided to search for independent housing, which they would still share with others, and the vast majority continues to live in *república* to this day. This is a suitable arrangement, since for the majority of Brazilians in Naas the objective in Ireland is still to work and save as much money as possible, and return to Brazil. Sharing accommodation proved to be financially beneficial and, equally important, it constituted a form of emotional support. In her work on Brazilian migrants in New York, Margolis states that Brazilians tended to share accommodation not only because rent in New York was costly but, ‘even if they could afford to, most Brazilians would choose not to live by themselves because of the loneliness that solitary living connotes’ (Margolis 1994: 71). In the absence of family networks, friends and housemates became like a second family, although many suggest that this family was never real since the norms regulating reciprocal cooperation and obligation in a family setting were never fully transposed to this ‘unnatural’ form of living so remote from the reality in Brazil.

Many of the Brazilians Lucas came to be reasonably close to in Ireland are people he knew from Presidente Epitácio, but the chances are that they would not have been friends had they met in Brazil. Ireland brings people together mainly as a result of a disjuncture with the past. There is a certain chance and randomness in these encounters (see Torresan 2011). On the other hand, friends in Brazil are understood as belonging to that group of people who have known each other from childhood, brought together by the proximity of the neighbourhood in Brazil and later in school. Friendships in Ireland are neither familiar nor natural, but are constructed and because of this, they feel constrained and never close enough. In fact, whilst living in Ireland -- which, paradoxically, does not often seem to be the case upon return -- migrants have suggested that it is unlikely that they will keep their friendships made in Ireland alive in Brazil, and justify this by the fact that in Ireland everyone had a degree of need for companionship which will not be the case in Brazil where they would return and reinsert themselves into their 'natural' networks of friends and family. Hence, these relationships in Ireland are not seen as hypocritical or insincere but they are relationships necessary for survival as a social person in a strange world. When Lucas and others sit to play poker on Saturday night, he is playing with people who, like himself, are brought together by the strangeness of living in Ireland and a sense of being disconnected from mainstream Irish society. There are no other nationalities playing cards than Brazilian, and while men gamble, women converse and watch Brazilian television, and children play. As the night progresses, men keep playing, sometimes until morning, and women and children retreat to their bedrooms in neighbouring houses.

Whilst the value placed on sharing accommodation both for financial and emotional reasons is unquestionable, *viver em república* also meant that the bedroom became the only private space where life was to be lived. In fact, many of the private

conversations and recorded interviews were conducted in migrants' bedrooms. But, the bedroom is also a space which is nearly too private, which is one of the reasons why Lucas and I decided to meet in a bar, somewhere public but still anonymous.

Lucas tells me that he had a clear plan when he left Brazil for the first time which involved working in Ireland for one year, save enough money to buy a house to live in, and return to Brazil most likely to the job that he once held. Although many like him left without knowing exactly how much their earnings were going to be in Ireland, they knew it was a salary above the one they had in Brazil, and more importantly there was scope to work overtime which added to the overall salary:

When I arrived, I used to do a lot of overtime, I started full of energy, I wanted to work, not that I don't want to work nowadays but things have changed a lot. I needed to help my mother, so I really worked. ... I worked 70 hours per week, 75, 40 regular plus 20, 25, 30 hours overtime. Sometimes I started at 5am and finished at 8, 9pm, everyday, so it was a heavy workload, but I was young, I didn't get tired. ... Today I'm more settled ... I came thinking that I was going to earn a minimum of one and a half [minimum salaries in Brazil] and I was earning 800 pounds ... in Brazil that was over R\$1000, ... in a week I earned 2 minimum salaries, do you understand? ... in a month I used to earn 6, 7, 8 minimum salaries, depending on the amount of overtime per month, so, it's like, I did a lot of things ... I bought a house for my mother, I bought a house for my grandmother, I did a few things.³ (Interview, May 2011)

Remoteness from Brazil manifested itself in a lack of family support and distance from their spouses, children and parents, the inability to communicate in English, and in a new found relationship with money as most found themselves, for the first time in their lives, with money to spare. For many, the prospect of earning a high wage far outweighed the amount of hours they would have to work. In his spare time, which was

³ In 2001 the official monthly minimum salary in Brazil was 180 Reais (see <http://www.contabeis.com.br/tabelas/salario-minimo/>) which at the time amounted to approx. 72 Irish Pounds. At the time, migrants reported earning, allowing for overtime, approx. 800 Irish Pounds per week, and earning anything between 6 and 8 current Brazilian minimum salaries in a month. In comparative terms, migrants were earning approx. 8000 Reais per month in Ireland. In 2011, when I carried out fieldwork in Brazil, the monthly minimum salary at the time was 545 Reais which came to approximately 235 Euros. Meat Boners in Brazil earn above minimum wage and in 2011, depending on which meat factory the worker worked in – the factory in Bataguassu about 30 kilometres from Presidente Epitácio, paid a basic salary of 800 Reais (approx. 344 Euros) plus a variable amount which usually pushed the salary to anything between 1,200 and 1,800 Reais (approx. 515 and 770 Euros); the other factory, located in Presidente Epitácio, paid a fixed amount of 1,200 Reais (approx. 515 Euros). Although by 2011 overtime had been greatly reduced, Brazilian salaries still compared poorly to the amounts earned in Ireland working in the same job where, in 2011, migrants were earning on average between 1400 and 2000 Euros depending on their contract and overtime. However, the gap between salaries in Brazil and in Ireland had greatly decreased due to two main reasons: firstly, overtime in Ireland had been, by 2011, greatly reduced if not fully stopped as a consequence of the economic recession; and secondly, the Brazilian economy improved between 2000 and 2011 during which the national monthly minimum salary increase by 360%. Although in comparative terms Irish salaries were substantially higher, many migrants suggested however that due to the cost of living in Ireland, Irish salaries did not enable them to save in any substantial way, and found it increasingly difficult to send remittances to Brazil.

not much, Lucas studied English so he would be able to interact with others but mainly to kill the loneliness and homesickness. However, 6 months later, Lucas met a Brazilian girl in Ireland from his hometown in Brazil and then everything changed. He stopped going to English lessons and with the passing of time Lucas started working over the weekends to complement his income largely to respond to the expectation that with a girlfriend might come a family and he should be prepared to support and provide for them and eventually return to Brazil in a stable financial situation -- at any given weekend Lucas would earn around €1,000 providing electrical services for other Brazilians in the area. Mirroring his work-ethic in Brazil, Lucas was working a full working week plus overtime plus weekends. And, that is how at the end of the first year he had already paid for the house he had bought before coming to Ireland. The workload was excessive and he eventually gave it up. After living five years in Ireland, Lucas owned three houses in Brazil. He bought one every year during the first three years and now he is an established landlord in Brazil. His parents chose the house, did all the paperwork, and chose the lodger. They also kept the money from the rent.

Lucas has some family in Naas but his ambition was to return to Presidente Epitácio, where he would be able to stay close to his family and enjoy the fruits of his work in Ireland. Lucas never stops thinking of returning to Brazil, he is saving for a business there although he is not quite sure what that business is going to be. That said; there are two things he seems to be quite certain about: firstly, that upon return to Brazil he will have to work and, secondly, that he does not want to work for anyone else but himself, well at least if he can avoid it. Lucas knows that the money he is earning in Ireland will give him a good head-start to set up a business in Brazil but he is also very aware that that money will not last forever, so he must be wise in his investments. At the time he was considering buying a small truck so he would be able to work

delivering something, but he is not sure what that something will be or even why he thinks that buying a small truck is a good idea.

Most of this conversation took place in 2006. In 2010, as we sat down for another formal interview, Lucas had a clear date and a well thought-through plan for his return. He would return to Brazil a year later, which he did, and he had a business already profitable in Brazil to return to which he had set up with his brother who was living in Presidente Epitácio and running things whilst Lucas was away. He had a house which he rented out, and a big house to live in. He also had some investments and a little *pé de meia* that is, some savings to keep him going during those first few months in Brazil. Lucas had no illusions about his return and knew that he would miss the comfort that Ireland had provided him with, but he had no doubts that his place was in Brazil and that his time in Ireland had run its course. Referring to the conversation from five years earlier, Lucas says ‘I had the idea of returning to Brazil but then I changed my mind, I wanted to stay longer. But now I want to go back again ... I miss home’ (Interview, December 2010). Lucas’s trajectory highlights the complexities of migration, it shows the certainties which become doubts which become certainties, and which are likely to become doubts again. For Lucas, thinking about return was not a straightforward affair, it involved serious and measured consideration over a long period of time, and the decision to return to Brazil, when he finally made it, was not only dependent on rational and reasoned decisions but was also profoundly influenced by emotional triggers and personal responses.

Second wave - Tricking time

Massey et al. suggest that ‘the causation of migration becomes cumulative because each act of migration alters the social context within which subsequent migration decisions are made, thus increasing the likelihood of additional movement’ (2002: 20; see also

Massey and Zenteno 1999). However, this process which has been described as ‘cumulative causation of migration’ is tightly connected to what is often seen as the costs of migration. The case of Brazilian migrants to Naas contradicts this theory since the increase in migration flows that subsequently took place did not occur because the costs of international migration had fallen, quite the opposite. Emigrating, for migrants directly recruited in Brazil was less costly than for those emigrating afterwards. As the legal and work requirements changed in Irish migration policy, and as the social context changed, the cost of migration increased.

The second wave of Brazilian migrants obtained jobs in Naas, also in Queally Group, through relatives and friends who were already living in Ireland; direct recruitment had, at this stage, stopped. Many saw their relatives and friends financial successes, and put their names forward to work in Ireland. Although meat factories in Naas prior to 2001 were mainly recruiting Meat Boners, in mid- to late-2001 the same factories started to employ and to apply for work permits for Brazilians to work in other general services such as processed food packaging. The relatives of those interested would then put their name on a list in the company they worked for and, as vacancies and work permits became available, the workers would inform their relatives and non-blood kin in Brazil to make the necessary arrangements to travel to Ireland.

Luis emigrated to Ireland in 2002 on his own and he emphasized that emigrating was never something he aimed for but when he saw his brothers returning to Brazil on holidays, and the investments that they started to make, he decided that perhaps this could be a good opportunity for him and his family, as he reflects here:

I came because my brothers were already here ... and I saw that they were doing well, so I couldn't miss this opportunity ... they asked me if I wanted to come and I was already willing to come because I saw that they were achieving things and I also wanted to achieve them... they used to send money, my father would look after their properties, after their things, so I thought “I want that for myself”. Who wouldn't, isn't it? (Interview, January 2011)

As family members started to migrate to Ireland, brothers, sisters, cousins, brothers-in-law, sisters-in-law, would be placed in accommodation arranged by the employer but would then make arrangements to rent an independent house and move in together. Others remained in the house provided by the employer but as more people started to move in with relatives, room vacancies would open up in the different houses and those already in the house would save them for their relatives. Living in a house with close family members was a main source of comfort, especially for those who had left their own nuclear family in Brazil. Luis recalls that first year he spent on his own whilst Vitoria, his wife, was still in Brazil:

Vitoria stayed with my parents, I built a one-bedroom house at the back of my parents' house, and I came here ... she stayed alone but at the same time she was with my family who lived at the front of the house ... I had my brothers here ... so I knew I was going to live with them but I hadn't a clue what the job was. I thought it was to work as a Meat Boner but when I arrived I got work in something completely different [processed food] ... the beginning was very difficult ... not the work, work was not difficult because it was simple, but I mean the day itself, when I was working I was ok, but when I went home I was alone, I spent 2 months living in my bedroom. I would get home, call Brazil almost every day, so the beginning was difficult ... but I started to adapt when I moved in with my brothers. (Interview, May 2011)

A year later, Luis was offered another one-year contract in the meat factory in Naas. Although his plan was only to stay in Ireland for only one year, a situation similar to most people who emigrated with him, when he saw that the money he was earning in Ireland was well beyond his expectations he decided to renew his contract indefinitely. However, Luis was not happy away from his family, so when his employer asked him and others to recommend other people in Brazil who might have been interested in emigrating, Luis recommended his wife and a relative.

Vitoria moved to Ireland to work in the meat processing factory and to join her husband. Similar to many other families, during the time she spent in Ireland, Vitoria left her children with her mother. Decisions were made at family level, often involving the patriarch and the matriarch, and it is not unusual to see families where all siblings

migrated to Ireland. Dona Judite, who worked in the meat factory in Presidente Epitácio before retiring, saw all of her children migrating to Ireland. She recounts the feelings of loss and helplessness during the first few years, and remembers the moments of confusion when she said goodbye to Vitoria when she entered the bus which would take her through a ten-hour bus journey to São Paulo, where she would then get a flight to Europe and re-unite with her husband:

It was so difficult ... at the beginning, I fell ill ... they used to call on the weekend, when the phone rang ... I would run to the phone so I could get it [in time], then it wasn't them. ... When the phone rang again "oh, it's them" and I would go running again, and when it was them, I cried, and cried, and cried ... it took me a while ... but I couldn't have imagined the reaction that I was going to have when I saw Vitoria going into that bus, ... she went in, and I'm going to tell you the truth, it's almost embarrassing but my feeling at that time was as if she was in a coffin ... and then I looked at her children and thought that I had to be strong for them. ... it was only when they started coming and going on holidays, coming and going, that I got used to it ... but I never brought any of them to the bus station again. (Interview, June 2011)

Nearly a year later, and although she had been offered a second work contract, Vitoria decided that staying in Ireland without her children was not an option for her, and so she returned to Brazil. Luis stayed in Ireland but it was not too long after that he felt that living apart from his family was not what he wanted from life. They had been married for over ten years but both knew that living separate lives, one in Ireland and one in Brazil, could only end one way. Both Luis and Vitoria refer to friends whose marriage broke up when one of them decided to stay in Brazil whilst the other was in Ireland for an extended period of time, and they knew that the same could happen to them. So, although the rumour was that most migrants were not entitled to bring their families to Ireland, Luis made it his business to gather the relevant information and finally got to the conclusion that his family could come to Ireland but his wife would not be automatically entitled to a work permit since she had given up her job before returning to Brazil. So Luis started thinking of alternatives.

Luis is not only a ‘problem-solver’ and a ‘go-getter’, he has the energy of that kind of people who believe that everything can be achieved and each problem has at least one solution. He speaks fast and spontaneously; his wife, Vitoria, is articulate, each word carefully considered, and every step carefully taken. Largely because of these characteristics, in 2003, just a few months before he and his wife made the decision that the whole family, wife and children, would move to Ireland, he suggested to his wife that she should take a course in Brazil on something which she could then use in Ireland, since at the beginning of 2003 she would not be able to return to the meat factory as, at that stage, work-permits for non-EU were becoming increasingly restricted.

At the time, the vast majority of Brazilians in Naas worked in the meat processing plant and there was high demand for informal jobs such as cleaning, hairdressers, beauticians making house-calls, bakers, child-minders and other jobs which developed organically as a result of an increase in the Brazilian population in Naas. Most Brazilians, even today and more than fifteen years later, still prefer to get their hair styled, nails done, buy birthday cakes baked and snacks cooked by other Brazilians. When Vitoria reunited with her husband in Ireland she had in the meantime done one such course, so when she arrived in Ireland she immediately started working as a self-employed person in the informal economy. Their initial aim was to buy a house of their own in Brazil, something that would only have been possible, had they stayed in Brazil, in the long-term and with much effort:

In Brazil it’s very difficult to achieve anything ... you have to have a good job, a very good salary to be able to get somewhere because otherwise you can’t move forward, so we realised that by working in Ireland we could buy a house quickly, I mean, in comparison to Brazil. (Interview, May 2011)

They both worked endlessly to achieve that goal: Vitoria worked all the hours she could as ‘self-employed’ and Luis held two different jobs. They worked hard and

saved all the money they could. Although Luis and Vitoria are extremely proud of their financial achievements in Ireland, they say that these achievements were only possible through constant hard work, and a constant and persistent focus on their objective, as they know that not everyone who emigrated earned and saved as much as they did.

Through direct recruitment in Brazil or through a web of family connections, those who emigrated during the first and the second wave of migration from Presidente Epitácio to Naas tended to have their own work permit, or at least were entitled to reside in Ireland. Many migrants note that those who arrived in 1999 and early 2000 had to lay the foundations for those who followed on their footsteps, so those who arrived from 2000 onwards could rely on friends and family members for practical and cultural cues.

Almost all of those who emigrated to Naas knew each other, directly or indirectly, and almost all who emigrated during the first and second wave of migration had worked in the same meat factory, one of the biggest employers in Presidente Epitácio. However, although many of the workers had the resources, both social and financial to emigrate, not all had the social capital to do so. As Anthias notes:

We should confine the notion of social capital to mobilisable social ties and networks. In other words networks and ties which are not mobilisable for the pursuit of advantage, or the mitigation of disadvantage, are not usefully referred to as social capital (2007: 788).

In the case of Brazilian migrants who settled in Naas, family networks transformed ordinary relationships into potential sources of social and financial capital, and reciprocal and moral obligations became the rationale through which social capital was to be enacted. That family network becomes an important source of social capital is not surprising as, traditionally in Brazil, it is within the close-knit unit of the nuclear and the extended family as well as non-blood kin that personal problems are shared, discussed and solved, and potential gains are calculated. The value of the family, as suggested by Korin et al. is 'probably the most central element of Brazilian culture.

Indeed, the family constitutes the most important source of support throughout a person's life' (2005: 169). Of course, decisions made by and within the extended family structure and falling within kinship hierarchies, can in some cases, especially as illustrated by examples of migrants who arrived during the third wave as a tourist or on a student visa, be detrimental to the well-being of migrants and can be a source of misinformation that profoundly shapes decisions and affects lives.

The third wave - No one waits for me to call

Apart from spouses and children, as in the case of Vitoria and her children, the third wave of migrants also included a parallel movement of adult children and close relatives, mainly in their late teens and early twenties, who arrived at the end of 2003 and beginning of 2004 onwards to work in the informal economy which reflected Brazilian life in Ireland; these faced a very different reality. From 2003 onwards, obtaining new work permits for Brazilians was becoming increasingly difficult, especially for those who could not enter the country on a spouse or dependant permit. So, some travelled to Ireland on a student visa and others entered Ireland as a tourist and subsequently overstayed their entry authorisation.

'In Ireland I'm not living ... I'm wasting my life' (Interview, June 2010). This is how Alice started one of our many conversations. It was a Saturday afternoon, a busy day for many Brazilians in Naas, when we met for a recorded interview. The house was full, as it usually was, of other Brazilians. Food shopping is usually done on Saturdays, women and men get their nails done, and women get their hair styled by other Brazilians working as beauticians who do house-calls. If there is a birthday, christening, baby-shower party the house is prepared for the occasion, food is cooked, balloons are inflated and are fixed to the walls in order to decorate the sitting room and kitchen areas; cakes and snacks are ordered from other Brazilians, and the family or families

living in the house prepare to receive relatives and friends. Even on days when there is no specific occasion, houses are rarely quiet, and there is a constant coming and going of relatives, neighbours and friends who call in to the house for a few moments, make some small talk and often leave after having a quick *cafezinho*. Alice and I met in her bedroom, tape recorder on, and door ajar through which we could hear the voices and laughs of those downstairs.

The house is in a residential area beside the Dublin road, and before one gets to Naas town proper, where most Brazilians in Naas live. It is also very close to QK Meats and Dawn Farms where many Brazilians work as Meat Boners and in other jobs related to meat processing. On this particular Saturday I took the bus from Dublin and got off at the bus stop where the Naas suburbs start and made my way to Alice's house. But as usual, I get lost in the suburbs. Because of all the wondering around through rows and lanes of houses with only very subtle differences between them, I am already late to meet Alice. The suburbs feel cold, impersonal and especially tidy with very little out of place. When I finally find the house, I am greeted with hugs and kisses, and a sentence uttered amidst smiles and which immediately puts me at ease, 'Diana, did you get lost again?' I still have my coat on and a cup of coffee is immediately placed in my hand, and I'm quickly brought up to date with the developments that have been happening with the 'Brazilians' -- who is pregnant, who is sick, who has returned to Brazil, who has returned to Ireland? After this initial chat, Alice and I retreat to her bedroom where we can talk in private to save us from interruptions and from being overheard.

'You know', Alice confides, 'I never wanted to come' (Interview, June 2010). The sadness in her deep black eyes casts a shadow over her usual vivacious personality. She is in her early twenties and has been in Ireland for a considerable time. She is energetic, smiles easily, and likes her 'bling'. One day while we were in Brazil, we decided to show each other our accessories. She looked through my things

disappointingly and said, 'You're not really a, "I've arrived girl", are you? ... You know, you don't wear stuff that when you come into a room your jewellery says, "I've arrived"'. Alice is that kind of girl, fun and bubbly, and her wishes and wants are usually framed by respectfulness and compliance with her parents' wishes.

When she was asked and agreed to come to Naas, she was working in Presidente Epitácio. Her father advised her to leave her job in Brazil and come to Ireland where she would earn some money, and would be helping out her relatives with child-minding when necessary. Initially, the idea was not terribly unappealing because Alice had seen what her father had achieved. He had already bought two houses in Brazil and she thought that perhaps she would be able to achieve, at least, a house for herself. However, the idea of migrating to Ireland was never too seductive either mainly because she already had a job, a boyfriend and a life in Brazil. She had heard that Ireland was not 'what it used to be', and she was unsure of what life held for her in Naas. At the same time, she could not say 'no' to her parents and relatives, and eventually decided to migrate to Ireland.

For reasons that no one can rationally explain, Alice ended up travelling to Ireland and entering the country as a tourist, which would allow her to remain for thirty days -- thereafter she would either remain in Ireland in an irregular situation or would have to return to Brazil. Whilst still in Brazil, the discussion between Alice, her parents and her relatives in Ireland was whether she should 'buy' a student visa or not, in order to avoid the situation in which she found herself sometime later. As it usually is, the decision was taken amongst the extended family and the decision for her to travel as a tourist prevailed, as some of her relatives were of the opinion that 'buying' a student visa was a waste of money -- and I should note here, that in all my years working with Brazilian migrants I have never heard anyone referring to a student visa as something one applies for, rather the word used has always been 'bought'. Their reasoning was not

completely unfounded, since stories abound of migrants who travelled to Ireland on a valid student visa but were then prevented from entering the country at an immigration control checkpoint.

A good example of this is Joana, a good friend of Alice, who was granted 'leave to enter' Ireland whilst her boyfriend was barred at immigration control. Joana's belief was that it was down to 'luck', they both had a student visa, the only difference is that her father was at the airport to meet her -- it is also worth noting here that she was by then an adult and therefore her father being there should have made no difference. The decision was left to the immigration officer, and so she was granted leave to enter the country and her boyfriend was refused; Joana ends up saying, 'I don't know how to explain it' (Interview, January 2011).

On that Saturday, as we sat on the edge of the bed talking and watching the rain fall outside, Alice tells me about what she would be doing if she were in Brazil: going to the river, chatting outside the house, visiting relatives, walking by the riverfront in the heat and sunshine with her friends. It is not only that she missed doing all those things: Alice feels excluded from her family and friends' lives in Brazil, and feels that she does not have a life of her own in Ireland. Furthermore, she has nothing to tell to them when she rings and, even if she did, it is only occasionally that she gets to talk to her family and friends in Brazil. The reason is not the cost of speaking on the phone since the price of international calls has decreased hugely in recent years and, in any case, many people would now have access to the internet. The problem Alice tells me is that 'no one stays at home waiting for you to call' (Interview, June 2010). Her friends and family have their own lives, free lives, lived outside where they can go wherever they want, whenever they want. On the other hand, Alice is reminded that her life is being lived inside, largely because of the weather in Ireland, but also because of her immigration status and her fear of being caught by the police and being deported to

Brazil. Thus, every time the phone rings out when she calls her friends and relatives in Brazil, she is reminded of that situation in very clear but silent terms. Moreover, she is working uncertain days, usually not more than 3 days per week and earning €70 or €80 per day. Of that money, part is handed to her parents and she keeps some for herself and for her own expenses.

She stayed but after the initial three months in Ireland, Alice had a change of heart: 'I wanted to go home [Brazil] ... but then I thought, since I'm already here I'll wait a bit more and see if I can regularise my immigration status, but then one day follows another and, as I couldn't regularise my situation, I ended up returning' (Interview, June 2011). Realistically, the chances of Alice remaining in Ireland 'legally' were close to none. Since she had entered the country on a tourist visa and had overstayed her thirty days, and since Irish immigration policy did not allow for student visas to be issued if the migrant was already in the country, Alice's choices were either returning to Brazil and 'buying' a student visa which in any case did not automatically guarantee that she would be granted 'leave-to-enter' at immigration control when she landed in Dublin; either marrying someone with Irish citizenship or 'stamp 4' -- an option which she did not even contemplate; or finding a job in which the employer would be willing to apply for a work permit for her -- which was unlikely since Ireland was already in the midst of an economic crisis and unemployment levels rocketed, and in any case it was even less likely that a work permit would be granted by the state. All in all, Alice had two real options, either she stayed in Ireland with an immigration status which put her in a situation of irregularity or she returned to Brazil. She stayed for a year.

Alice is not unusual in her situation. Many of her relatives, friends and contemporaries in Naas are in the same situation. They either travelled on a student visa or entered Ireland as a tourist and subsequently overstayed their entry authorization.

Others, who travelled in the same circumstances but who were, in general, older, single and had families in Brazil to support, used the same strategies or opted for marriages of convenience if their immigration status in the country became problematic. Others bring forward engagements and weddings if this means the person with an irregular immigration status can remain in Ireland. The point here may well be, as Breckenridge and Appadurai argue, that migratory movements of people are ‘indifferent to the idiosyncrasies of nation-states and often flow through their cracks and exploit their vulnerabilities’ (1989: i). I would not go as far as to say that migratory flows are ‘indifferent’ to the influences of nation-states, however, since nation-states play a vital role in regulating and reinforcing migration processes, but I do think that migrants navigate their lives in the gaps, or the ‘cracks’, between law and policy, and everyday life. However, this is not without consequences. The result for Alice was that, like many others in her situation, she ended up staying in Ireland ‘illegally’ for what remained of her time in the country, which profoundly crippled her job opportunities, her opportunities to learn English and travel, and limited her socialisation to private spaces such as the houses of other family members and close friends who she knew from Brazil.

Because of the nature of their status in Ireland, this group becomes more heavily reliant on a dense web of family connections. Many saw the opportunity to travel to Ireland as a way to stay close to their families, especially in the case of children and young adults. For others, who were either studying or unemployed in Brazil, earning a salary in Ireland presented them with a unique possibility -- a few even saw it as an adventure. This cohort of migrants have experiences that are significantly different from other Brazilian migrants who had travelled to Ireland either on a work permit or those who arrived as spouses or dependants of work permit holders.

Alice found herself in Ireland at a time when the country was already in a deep economic recession; she did not speak English and found it increasingly difficult to find work. During that year in Ireland Alice saved no money at all because:

Whatever I earned I would then spend, as it was very little ... but for people like my father, he's able to save some money, right? He has a fixed job, he knows how much he's going to earn per week, so he pays his bills and he's able to keep some in the bank. (Interview, June 2011)

The year spent in Ireland was so unprofitable for Alice that her father had to pay for her return ticket as she had not saved enough to pay for it. But the 'costs' of that year in Ireland went beyond mere money. The consequences of living in a situation of irregularity meant that Alice was afraid of spending too much time outside the protection of her own house, as she illustrates here:

I was afraid. In fact we didn't even wear the jersey of the Brazilian national squad as we were afraid that the "Garda" would ask for our passport, so we tried not to get in trouble, right? All of that so we wouldn't get in trouble with the "Garda" because you might be in the right but if you're illegal in the country, you're the one in the wrong ... the "Garda" went to our house a few times ... because other Brazilians denounced us ... we have an idea who denounced me but I can't be sure, so it's like if someone has a grudge in work, for example in the meat factory ... with my father ... they get revenge by denouncing us to the "Garda" because they know that there are people illegal in the house. It's Brazilians denouncing other Brazilians. (Interview, June 2011)

When the police came to the house and rang the door bell, only one month after Alice's arrival, those in the house would just let the bell ring because they knew what the policemen were after. At some point the situation was so bad and everyone in the house was so on edge that the family moved out. Alice talks about those times as full of 'anguish', a mental state which was not compensated by material earnings:

Look, being in that situation would be worthwhile if I had been making money ... earning €100 per day. If I was making €100 per day I would be there until today, no problem? You want to know why? Because I was thinking of my future, isn't it? So I could have a house, so I could have a better life here, in Brazil, do you understand? (Interview, June 2011)

Contrary to Lucas's circumstances whose daily life is projected into the future and the financial security that Ireland will bring, Alice can't escape the restrictions of her present situation, and the future is now bleaker than before. Looking back, Alice tells me that if she knew what she knows today she would have never gone to Ireland:

What? I wouldn't even had stepped foot on that airplane, I wouldn't have gone because things weren't explained to me as they were, if my father had said, "Look, you're going to come over, you're going to enter as a tourist and then you're going to become illegal, you'll have to try your luck", do you understand? But I wasn't told the details, if I had been told I wouldn't have gone, if my father had said, "Look, if you come you'll be taking a risk, do you want to come?" and in that case I would have said, "No, I'm not going".
(Interview, June 2011)

She ended up returning to Brazil one year later and in worse circumstances than when she came to Ireland. About those initial months in Ireland she recalls:

I thought that I would get there and people would be knocking on my door offering me a job ... people said that there, in Ireland, was really good, that you could earn lots of money ... so you have the idea that you're going to get there, and there is a job waiting ... but if you're going as an illegal ... it's not worthwhile ... I didn't even save the money to pay for my flight ticket.
(Interview, June 2011)

Once the decision to go to Ireland was made, Alice started to dream about the things she could possibly achieve, 'a house, a car, to have a good life, having everything you need, if you need you have money, you know?' Unfortunately none of these dreams came through and in the absence of a fixed job and a regular immigration status, and the permanent fear of being caught by the immigration police, Alice ended up spending a large part of her time at home and whilst other people may have learnt some English Alice learnt only enough to be able to make herself understood at the 'supermarket, basic things, go to internet shop, only these little things but not enough for me to sit down and have a conversation, no, only the very basic' (Interview, June 2011). The little that Alice learnt was with her siblings and friends as she did not need English to do her work, and the lack of English prevented her from looking for any other job.

A few months later I was in Brazil and Alice came to meet me at the place where I was staying. It was mid-afternoon of a winter day but the sun shone in our backs and we were both comfortable in our short sleeves and summer clothes. The house was quiet and Alice recalled the time in Ireland when she could not express herself in English. She tried doing small jobs for Irish people in the informal economy and remembers the difficulty when trying to understand what her employer wanted her to do:

She would explain, I mean the basic, sometimes it was difficult to work like that ... sometimes she would even get a bit anxious because I couldn't understand ... so she had to show me what she wanted me to do ... so she would show me but then she would get annoyed because I couldn't understand, you know? Sometimes I would be a little bit hurt because I couldn't communicate with people ... sometimes, when going out with my siblings, like we would go to the houses of immigrants from other countries, they would talk away and I would be quiet, I felt like a mute, I felt mute, everyone was chatting, laughing, and I had to laugh as well, right? So I wouldn't look like a fool, like I hadn't a clue what was going on ... there were times when I felt isolated, on the spot, because I couldn't communicate. (Interview, June 2011)

Like others in her situation, Alice felt inadequate, and for the first time in her life she missed being able to communicate in her own language, and day-dreamed about being in Brazil and being able to understand and be understood:

My goodness, I thought, if I were in Brazil I would be speaking to everyone ... I loved when I got to the airport in São Paulo, speaking Portuguese, and I said to myself "my God, what a wonderful thing, I can understand everyone". There were times in Ireland when I went to the supermarket and all I could hear was zumzumzum zumzumzum, I couldn't understand a thing ... [when in Brazil] I could understand ... you feel more at ease ... I missed speaking to people, I needed to communicate with people. (Interview, June 2011)

Those who arrived in Ireland on a student visa were entitled to live, study English and, under certain restrictions, work in Ireland. Those who arrived as tourists and overstayed their entry requirements, were not allowed to study English and had to become invisible outside their most intimate circle of family and friends. These two groups had, however, one commonality: they were, in their vast majority, working in

the informal economy. In general, even those who were entitled to work preferred to do it for their families and friends rather than joining the labour market where they would be required to speak a minimum level of English. In all the cases encountered here, all student visa holders arrived in Ireland to ‘help’ their families, and the vast majority of young women came to mind their siblings or their relatives’ young children and usually earned around €150 per week. Young males would usually find work as labourers, and some as cleaners, but the amount of work available tended to be more sporadic than for young females. In either case, their income would usually be used to supplement their parents’ incomes. In general, these two groups of migrants speak about their experiences in very different terms, especially about the sense of freedom, or the lack of, felt in Ireland; these experiences would strongly influence and frame their return to Brazil.

Others, generally married couples, found it increasingly difficult to maintain conjugal relationships at a distance. Until 2003 most migrants had postponed bringing their families, mainly those with children, to Ireland for three main reasons: (1) many believed that they were not entitled to bring their spouses and children over to Ireland; (2) Ireland was always meant to be a short-term project to earn money for a house. Each new year that went by was meant to be the last in Ireland, but as time passed the decision to return to Brazil suffered several readjustments as did the initial goal of buying a house; and, (3) bringing their families over presupposed a financial investment in flights, accommodation, and schooling which would interfere with the migrants’ capacity to save money. Families had to make important decisions. Vitoria remembers telling her husband:

There comes a time when you have to take a stand, I told him, “There are only three options here: either you return, or I go to Ireland with the children, or we get a divorce”. (Interview, December 2010)

Others, regret deciding against taking their families to Ireland. William, a friend of Luis and Vitoria, who had migrated to Ireland in 2002, separated from his wife after a few years abroad. William reflects that he is, by no means, an exception:

The vast majority of Brazilians ... who didn't take their families to Ireland, they all have lost their families ... separated, you know? ... The family ended, there was no way back, and in the end the money that I earned amounted to almost nothing because then, after the separation, you have to divide what you earned, right? So, I'm almost in the same [financial] situation as I was when I left. (Interview, July 2011)

It was around this time that Luis and Vitoria made the decision to move the whole family to Ireland. Like many couples, their children were still minors, which meant, in practice, that unlike Alice, who was already an adult when she travelled to Ireland, Luis and Vitoria's children had no problem joining them. Luis and Vitoria knew this would put some pressure on their financial situation especially since Vitoria was not entitled to work in Ireland -- she had given up that right the moment she returned to Brazil after a year working in Ireland and during which period she had a valid work permit, but since they already had a plot of land in Brazil, they decided to take a chance. However, sharing accommodation with other migrants proved to be a major obstacle for the couple:

For us, the beginning was a bit difficult ... we shared a house ... so we worried about the children, we didn't let them be because we thought they were bothering other people in the house, but you know, children are children, they like going up the stairs, going down the stairs, playing ... so we weren't totally free, ... and you know ... sharing a house with family is already complicated imagine with different people. (Interview, July 2011)

Soon after, they decided to move out and find an apartment for them and their children, as, as they explained:

You see, we shared a house because, at the beginning, ... we were afraid of spending, all that you earned you did your best to save it and bring it [to Brazil], so we avoided doing many things ... to make sure that we would save money, our objective was to save money, right? ... So we shared but when we saw that the problems were growing we thought, "Ah, no, let's stop this ... let's live, you,

me and the children, at least we have more freedom, we'll have our own life".
(Interview, July 2011)

Living alone with one's family is still rare, although it is becoming more common, but it is already an approximation to life in Brazil, a life where one has the freedom to 'do what I want ... to invite whoever I want' in their own house, as one research participant put it. For the vast majority of migrants, a house in Ireland is still a place to 'pass through' but never a place to make one's own. This state of permanent unsettledness to live a private life in one's own house creates a feeling often identified as a 'lack of freedom'. As years went by and migrants were joined by their families, some families decided to move to small apartments on their own, but this came at a cost, both financially and support. For couples, this self-imposition of sharing a house is a sacrifice that is only justified by the impact that a lower rent will have on their remittances and ultimately on the achievement of their financial goal in Brazil.

At the same time that family circumstances were changing, migration policy in Ireland was also changing and in a way that did not favour non-EU/EEA migrants. One of the main government decisions that directly influenced the lives of Brazilians in Naas was the commitment not to impose restrictions on labour market access for the EU joining States on 1 May 2004, which resulted in a decrease of work permits being issued for non-EU/EEA. Moreover, until 1 January 2007 when the arrangements under the Employment Act, 2003 and the Employment Act, 2006 came into effect, spouses and dependants of work permit holders were entitled to reside in Ireland but were not automatically entitled to work permits.⁴ Furthermore, work permits were issued to the employer rather than the employee, which impacted negatively on job mobility.

For the majority of Brazilian migrants in Naas, a work-permit system which did not allow spouses and dependants to secure work in the formal economy, gave rise to

⁴ These arrangements have changed again, and from June 1st 2009 spouses and dependants of non-EU workers must apply for work permits on their own right. See http://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/employment/migrant_workers/employment_permits/spousal_work_permit_scheme.html

the development of a parallel structure in the informal market, and new strategies started to emerge. Spouses and dependants of work permit holders, who like Vitoria were entitled to live in Ireland, found jobs as cleaners, whether as self-employed or working for cleaning companies which were willing to overlook the migrant's work permit status. Whilst the difficulties associated with applying for a work permit could be understood as an impediment for the migrant's economic integration, the vast majority of Brazilians felt this was not the case. If anything, it was an advantage. Working in the informal economy meant that spouses and dependants would not have to pay taxes, and the work permit holder would be entitled to additional tax credits. By the time the new employment laws came into effect in 2007, the vast majority of spouses were already well settled in their informal jobs and joining the formal economy presented no advantages, especially in a context of very low levels of English language proficiency and of a lack of work qualifications.

More than employment permits, command of the English language or a lack of work qualifications, one of the most influential aspects of the emergence and maintenance of this informal economy is the fact that by the early 2000s the numbers of Brazilians in Naas had grown. Many suggest that there were over 1,000 Brazilians in Naas, and jobs mirroring social life in Brazil were now emerging. Hair-dressers, beauticians, bakers, cooks selling *salgados* (snacks), birthday party decorators, Brazilians working as taxi drivers for Brazilians only, baby-sitters and child-minders, and Brazilians setting up satellite dishes with Brazilian channels were all now in great demand. For most, these jobs were their only source of income, but for some it was used to supplement their main income source. It was in this emerging informal labour context that Lucas and Luis found jobs which complemented their income, and Vitoria and Alice found work.

Reciprocal cooperation becomes a vital source of support during the migratory process, during which individuals and families make a common investment in their future and the future of their relationships. As noted by Massey et al. (2002) migration decisions are taken within a complex network of family relationships rather than by isolated actors. In this context, migrants embark on a journey of migration not only for themselves but for the betterment of the family unit. Migrants entrust their investments to their families, usually their parents, in Brazil and, in return, migrants make sure that their families benefit equally from their work in Ireland. It is only through reciprocal cooperation based on the central role of the family in Brazilian life that migrants emigrate, in virtually all the cases, leaving their children, at least in a first instance, in the care of their grandparents, siblings, or non-blood relatives. As highlighted by Margolis:

In Brazil, relatives - grandparents, cousins, married siblings - typically see one another on a regular, even daily basis. Kin tend to live near one another, often residing in apartments in the same building in large cities, and a great deal of Brazilian social life revolves around the extended family. "Solitude" or the "solitary life" are terms Brazilians use to express the linguistic and social isolation of being far from friends and relatives. (1994:173)

The process of 'cumulative causation of migration' suggests that social capital accumulates over time, altering the social context within which subsequent migration decisions are made, and ultimately creating a social structure capable of sustaining further acts of migration (Massey et al. 2002). However, the migration context and the context within which decisions are made, and the accumulation of social capital are tightly dependant on legal constraints and immigration policy in the receiving country. Keeping this connection in mind, for the third wave of Brazilian migrants to Naas who had no legal rights and entitlements to work or reside in Ireland, family ties and financial resources have been identified as having a regressive effect insofar as the migratory experience acted as a step backwards in their lives. The question of returning

has always been present since I started doing fieldwork in 2005. As time went by, the circumstances and the timeframe through which return would take place became consistently more complex. From an initial clear plan of staying in Ireland for the period of one year, many migrants felt that returning to Brazil might not happen under the same parameters as before, and owning a house was not enough anymore. As Vitoria explains, echoing Lucas's own thinking, 'We always said, "This is our last year [in Ireland]" ... but once you've achieved something you want more' (Interview, December 2010).

For those like Lucas, and Luis and Vitoria who consider themselves as being successful, apart from an ambition to have more, remaining in Ireland became more and more difficult to explain, even though they were not sure what that more was. By this, I do not mean to suggest that for Alice and others like her remaining in Ireland or returning to Brazil was less ambiguous, but her life in Ireland and her return to Brazil, as well as her possibilities of re-emigrating to Ireland, were framed in considerably different terms.

Reflections on Policies and Persons

Migration policy is often based on common-sense assumptions which constitute migrants on the basis of their perceived rootedness if 'at home', or uprootedness if away from 'home'. At the centre of this line of thought, Malkki argues, is a 'sedentarism in our thinking' (1992: 31), which ascribes people to specific spatial partitions, and ascribe them to these territories as their natural place in the world. However, increasingly, migrants reject the world map of fixed borders and maintain lives here and there, and integrate and make use of multiple identities (see Rouse 1991). By so doing, they challenge many of these cultural and national common-sense assumptions, and create lives which are, unmistakably, in permanent motion.

Migration policy, at Irish national and European level, is often framed in these same terms and migrants tend to be defined by national states in economic and political terms. In that sense, policy tends to be restricted to a form of analysis which consistently separates the personal and the social, and consistently ignores the complexities of cultural expression which take place in the everyday. Yet, emigration is multi-layered, and independent return is also multi-layered, as is the possibility of re-migration. In that sense, return fits into a wide range of possible decisions for migrants, and these decisions are constantly being negotiated and renegotiated in daily life.

Anthropology can speak to and inform policy by giving priority, or at least, an equal place to the study of the social, cultural and kinship ties which create and sustain migratory movements. Moreover, the role of anthropology is to make sense of the migrant's everyday processes, and the reasons that are likely to influence their decisions to migrate which are often voided of their fluidity and transposed into static and fixed policies. By so doing, policy might come to portrait migrants not as economic units and the roles they come to fulfil in their social, cultural and administrative functions, suffering from the pathologies of 'displacement' but rather as persons inserted in broader social networks.

I propose that the inward movement of Brazilian migrants from Presidente Epitácio to Naas be considered in three distinct periods: the first wave, between 1998 and early 2001; the second wave, which I identify as taking place between mid-2001 until 2003; and finally a third wave which I propose took place from 2003 onwards. By considering these distinct three waves of Brazilian migrants to Ireland, we can start building bridges between the institutional and policy restrictions which influence the everyday of Brazilian migrants, and the transformation of kinship networks and obligations that develop with the introduction of a wider availability of money and

increase consumption levels, as well as the implications that all of these have when migrants consider return to Brazil which will be discussed in the next four chapters.

CHAPTER 2

Debt, money and what binds us together

I stood outside the gate and rang the bell. The house was walled, like almost all the houses in Presidente Epitácio, but as opposed to most, this one looked finished, almost pristine. On top of the wall there was an electric fence alerting prospective intruders that although only a two-metre wall separated them from coveted goods like huge plasma televisions the owners had also the means to protect their property. The house was squeezed between two others, both made of bricks and cement, one still to be plastered although it was clearly obvious that someone had been living there for some time, and the other which was painted but looked unfinished.

When Luis opened the door I was led into the sitting room where Vitoria was already waiting. We passed by a small yard, the green of the grass was vivid, which felt slightly odd because green spaces in Presidente Epitácio are rare due to the heat, and the cost and the amount of water needed to keep them that way. There were two armchairs and a table in the yard, facing the outside wall that separated the house from the street, made of solid and good quality wood, which had no resemblance to the usual chairs made of metal and plastic that were the common outdoor furniture in all the other houses I had been to. The sitting room was spacious, bright, and sober, and it could almost have been taken out of a home decoration magazine. We sit down and Coca-Cola is served. I had entered a different world.

Luis and Vitoria are at a point where, for the first time in their lives, their financial situation is not a problem. When reflecting on the life they had before emigrating to Ireland, their main concern was money, ‘getting to the end of the month’ and the anxiety caused by knowing that, more often than not, by the time the monthly salary was gone there was still a lot of month ahead of them. In that respect, their lives were not that different from most people they knew in Presidente Epitácio.

The town, Presidente Epitácio, is small by Brazilian standards, with a population of just over 41,000 people, and is located on the border between the State of São Paulo

(654Km from the state capital) and the State of Mato Grosso do Sul in Brazil. Its recorded history started at the beginning of the 20th century with the building of a road that linked the two States in what was then described as the ‘unknown dry-land’ (Godoy 2002: 7). *Sertão*, dry-land, is indeed very appropriate as the earth has that yellowish and reddish colour as if the ground had been sun-burnt; rain is sporadic, and when it comes it usually brings a storm with it, so typical of tropical climate. Until the beginning of the 1900s, the west of the State of São Paulo was inhabited by indigenous peoples, at a time when ‘no white man would dare to go through that route’

(<http://www.presidenteepitacio.com.br>); an old map of that State read ‘unknown territory inhabited by the indians’ (Godoy 2002: 17). Nowadays, this ‘unknown land’ has been replaced by Presidente Epitácio but the town has kept that ‘slow motion’ and vigilant feeling that the heat quite frequently brings with it, and people sit outside their houses, drinking *teréré* (cold tea leaf) watching others coming and going; children play soccer and run in the streets looking at the sky to see if their kites are standing above ground; and the air has the smell of over-dried earth. If it is cold, which is unusual, the streets become deserted and people retreat to their houses, and one can walk several blocks before a single soul appears.

Organised in a grid system, long streets stretch from one side of the town to the other, divided by the *Avenida*, or Avenue Presidente Vargas. *Avenida*, and nearby side streets, are the commercial focal point of Presidente Epitácio and where most shops and supermarkets are located. A quick browse on a few shops and through promotional material, and a striking feature starts to emerge when compared to any town in Ireland: all goods are advertised in instalments, from the smallest and cheapest product like a small hair-dryer that costs R\$50, just under €16 (payable in 10 instalments of R\$5), to a wardrobe that costs R\$1,339. But it is not only unessential goods that are paid on credit, some at 0% interest rate and others up to 60%, but nearly everything that is bought and

sold, from clothes to furniture and home appliances, from school material to petrol, from weddings and birthday parties to food, virtually everything is paid on credit. Although they knew it to be this way, since their return to Brazil paying goods in instalments is a major fault Luis and Vitoria find in Brazilian life, and they are critical about it as illustrated here:

There are a lot of people who have a new car, all that stuff, new clothes, all of that, but it's all bought on credit ... if you buy a pair of jeans you buy it ... in 10 instalments ... can you imagine, to buy a pair of jeans! (Interview, July 2011)

Credit accounts, which could be termed 'ordinary credit', are common and an integral part of everyday living, and paying them in full is a rare event. Vitoria illustrates these difficulties:

There were times when after paying all the outstanding bills and repayments, I would be left with another 15 days in the month when I had no money at all ... at the beginning of the month, you get paid, you pay what you owe, and that's it, finished, then it all starts all over again ... you leave payments *pendurados* [pending] ... until you get paid again and repay them. (Interview, April 2011)

Life in Brazil is lived in a permanent and normalised state of indebtedness, and before the salary is paid, money has already been assigned to perpetuate the cycle of debt generation, payment and repayment. This is the life in Brazil which Luis and Vitoria remember and which they are being pulled into upon their return. As Alice puts it, which echoes Vitoria's own reflections on a time pre-migration: 'In Brazil, when your shoes are worn out is when you finish paying the instalments' (Interview, April 2011). As opposed to life in Ireland where cash payments take centre stage, cash money is largely absent from everyday transactions in Presidente Epitácio where the transference of resources rests on a credit system which obeys a complex and interdependent network of personal relationships. In that sense, the normalised repayment of credit by instalments in local shops has a social function with the power to bind people together. But apart from an important social function, instalments have also

a moral function: they are levelling mechanisms used to bridge the moral obligation to lend money if a close friend or relative asks, and the individual choice to acquire goods. Along with money or resources comes the obligation to share, and not sharing inscribes clear boundaries between people, and determines the level of closeness or distance in their relationship. The examination and understanding of these credit systems and the social and moral obligations attached to them is important because they ultimately impact on the migrant's return. And although these obligations often fall outside the considerations of economic and migration policies, they are important elements that contribute to a decision to return, remain in Ireland, or re-emigrate.

Migration transforms the relationships between individuals, individuals and money and the objects of their desires. Through the distance introduced in the relationships between people, new structures of action start to emerge. Gestures and acts which, pre-migration, functioned as ways of maintaining the value of relationships, based on a form of what Marcel Mauss (2011[1954]) called 'gift exchange' and Marshall Sahlins (1972) calls 'generalized reciprocity' are deeply affected by more individualistic forms of relating to one another. Graeber (2001) notes that both of these forms of exchange are reciprocal, however the terms through which individuals relate to each other are considerably different. This chapter addresses these transformations and enquires into the principle of reciprocity, and the relationships that systems of exchange create and maintain in the lives of Brazilian migrants and on the lives of their kin in Brazil. Gift exchange, reciprocity and the concept of equivalence are important elements in the discussion of forms of exchange, which then provide a basis of inquire into the ways through which migrants define their world and what is important to them. As such, an exploration of the circulation of what is of value for Brazilian migrants provides a starting point, as Graeber suggests, 'to see how meaning, one might say, turns into desire' (2001: ix).

Jacques T. Godbout (1998) observes that a new way of reading modernity seems necessary in a context where a modern obsession with the market questions the acceptance of gift exchange as a reasonable form of analysis of the lives of modern men and women. Godbout ironically notes:

To assume our modernity (or post-modernity) is first and foremost to accept the non-existence or the insubstantiality of the gift: “Thou shalt believe only in hard reality, thou shalt resist the temptation to surrender to the gift”. This might be the first commandment of a catechism designed expressly for moderns. (1998: 1)

Critical of a worldview where considerations of gift relationships are not contemplated in an equal standing as explicit and tangible relations, Godbout suggests that we ‘must think of the gift not as part of a series of unilateral and discontinuous acts but as an element in a relationship’ (1998: 4). Before going any further, it seems necessary to go backwards and start with, what may be considered, the main work on the study of the gift which opens a discussion on the sociality of credit and debt.

Marcel Mauss (2011[1954]), in *The Gift*, offers an insight into the issues which must be included when discussing and investigating the everyday transactions taking place between individuals and communities. The gift economy, Mauss argues, is based on a form of voluntary-obligation exchange which engages people on permanent commitments and enhances solidarity as each gift is part of a system of reciprocity which involves the whole community. Mauss’s work is important precisely because it presents the gift cycle as a theoretical counterpart to Adam Smith’s ‘invisible hand’ and free-market, and illuminates the mechanisms through which individuals are able to protect their own interests without engaging in market exchange (see also Douglas 2000). For Smith, the free-market is the last stage of the progress of humankind, and self-interest is the source to a better life (2005[1902]: 143). Smith’s description of the four stages of humankind’s progress seems to culminate with the concept of private property and the ways that prevent trust to be broken when property rights are infringed

through the institution of a robust system of positive law and government. As Jerry Evensky notes, for Smith, 'absent these institutions, the potential for dispute and injury expands significantly and society can degenerate into constant conflict' (2011: 253).

One of the main points of contention between Smith and Mauss is precisely the fact that whereas the former provides an economic analysis largely based on the assumption that society is the outcome of individuals making self-interested decisions on their own private property, the latter sees non-instrumental relations as a system of reciprocity amongst groups which is a fundamental pillar in the articulation of social order and the bettering of all. As Claude Lévi-Strauss noted, Mauss sought to show that exchange consists 'not so much in economic transactions as in reciprocal gifts' (1971: 53) and that gifts are significant because they act as 'a total social fact' with implications 'at once social, psychological and economic' (Lévi-Strauss 1971: 61). As Mauss concluded through his observations of the potlatch system, and which Lévi-Strauss (1971) later discusses in his analysis of the principle of reciprocity, each gift exchange between communities are also important events of and fora for wealth distribution, which stands in contrast to individual wealth accumulation. Thus whilst the gift economy hinges on personal and on non-exchangeable relationships over a period of time and is subjective in nature, the market relies on direct, exchangeable and objective individual relationships which take place over a determined and fixed time span, and on a degree of flexibility as to whom may be paying debts.

Paradoxically however, and one could venture to say that Mauss would probably be appalled to see the idea of gift exchange being compared with the market, Mauss's gift echoes Adam Smith's idea of a free-market guided by trust insofar as both, the gift and the market, depend on a degree of invisibility and on principles of trust and 'faith'. As Evensky suggests, the individual energy at the basis of self-interest can only be 'unleashed by human freedom in almost magical ways ... where trust prevails' (2011:

250). Evensky also notes that trust must be understood here as empirical and calculative probability rather than 'faith', mainly because for Smith, 'faith' is faith in God and not in social relations or on what sustains them, and to the extent that trust between the parties decreases it has the opposite effect on the cost of the transactions. To ensure that such trust is cultivated, a system of positive laws and institutional power must be enforced, and 'to the degree that socialization of individuals as citizens inculcates "a sense of duty" to the set of civic ethics embodied in these positive laws, individuals can be trusted to police their own behaviour and the policing role of government, and thus the cost of community-based enforcement is reduced' (Evensky 2011: 251). As such, government does not 'micro-manage individual choice; it sets boundaries on the range of choice' (ibid.), whereas in what Smith considers previous stages of progress and giving 'the intimacy of this society, trust is policed first and foremost by the individuals themselves' (Evensky 2011: 252).

Trust then, is both at the centre of Smith and Mauss's arguments, which leaves us with the faint possibility that both the pure gift and the free-market co-exist within a space of complex human relations which are forged on relationships of trust nourished in the everyday. Nonetheless, Mauss is making a broader point where what remains important is not the logic of the market but the broader political implications that self-interest relations have on society at large, because for Mauss what was at the heart of exchange was, as Graeber notes, communism 'that is, an open-ended agreement in which each party commits itself to maintaining the life of the other' (2001: 65) in all its dimensions. These agreements are permanent relationships, as Graeber argues, because they cannot be cancelled out through payment. In this sense, market economies, as opposed to gift economies, 'are constantly obscuring the fact that all "economic" activity is ultimately a means to the creation of certain sorts of person' (2001: 211).

For Mauss, then, each transaction is consequential but it is also underlined by a moral imperative, and the balance between the two is at the heart of social cohesion. The core message of *The Gift* is that a gift system is a total system where all dimensions of social life must be seen as complementing each other. In that sense, credit and debt are inseparable and are one and the same thing, capable of building family and social ties even if these ties contribute to a hierarchical system which, in Mauss's view, will eventually balance itself out in the future. Arensberg (1988) makes a similar argument in his analysis of Irish familism in rural Ireland, where he notes that relationships of deference and respect assure the equilibrium between generations and lead to inevitable actions that change the established kinship system. Similar to family relationships in Brazil, the patterns of human action dictate that for balance to be maintained 'there can be no equality between the generations' (1988: 89), and as suggested by Korin et al., in Brazil, 'concepts of loyalty and obligation and accountability toward family influence personal choices and often compromise individual aspirations' (2005: 170).

Equally important for Mauss is the fact that the gift system opens the window to a view of inclusion and exclusion, in that in the 'account of all transfers ... one also knows who gets left at the end of the day without honour or citizenship and who benefits from the cumulative transfers' (Douglas 2000: xiii). In other words, it offers a view into who is included and who is excluded from the group. This is perhaps one of the key insights of *The Gift*. It is however important to acknowledge that, as Peebles avers:

Regardless of whether the resources transferred are commodities or gifts, an attachment among the creditor, the debtor, and the resources remains, and this is surely one of the defining features of credit-debt ... But we should not assume, ipso facto, that this translates into gifts being a better or somehow more moral form of social glue than commodities. (2010: 229)

If migration introduces new complexities in the everyday the question then is: to what extent do distance and money, gift and commodities, as well as moral and familial

obligations impact on the ways through which individuals understand their place in the world?

Both the gift economy and the market are conduits for the transference of resources, but whilst each gift has to be returned and, through this, it perpetuates the cycle of exchange and hence the relationship, the market relies on punctual and finite transactions of money and goods, which fit into specific time arrangements. Whilst the former is putatively altruistic, based on what Graeber (2001) calls 'open-ended rights' as a web of relations in which each other's lives depend upon the other and by extension upon the group, the latter relies on direct exchange and is purely consequential. Marshall Sahlins (1972) argues that peacemaking and peacekeeping is maintained through these continuous forms of reciprocity. In that respect, reciprocity is not a sporadic event which happens to respond to moments of anxiety but is a constant presence in everyday life. Between these two poles of reciprocal relationships, on the one side the pure gift and altruistic relationships, which Sahlins (1972: 193ff) calls 'generalized reciprocity', and on the other 'negative reciprocity' which is a more impersonal form of exchange and through which participants in the transaction represent opposed interests and each aim 'to maximize utility at the other's expense' (1972: 195), there exist 'intervals of sociability' which are marked by social distance. Between these two poles stands 'balanced reciprocity' which is a direct form of exchange, marked by equivalent transactions. Sahlins suggests that close kinship relations tend to be altruistic, hence suggesting that kinship relations are regulated by the exchange of 'pure gift' as Malinowski called it (Sahlins 1972: 191). The wider the social distance between people, the more their relations would be regulated by 'negative reciprocity', that is, individual self-concern. It is important to clarify that for Sahlins (2008) kin relationships are not necessarily genealogical or corporeal, but they grow

from a moral foundation of mutual aid and equality, they are a ‘mutual relationship of being ... which is intrinsic to one’s own existence’ (2008: 46).

It seems to me that kinship relations are, then, a fluid concept, which are inclined towards deeply altruistic actions but as social distance increases, they are likely to adapt to their new surroundings and new moral compasses, and Sahlins notes that ‘broadly speaking, mutuality of being among kinfolk declines in proportion to spatially and/or genealogically reckoned distance’ (2011b: 234). Hence, as Sahlins (1972) suggests it is relevant to enquire into the power individuals and communities have in determining social distance, because, amongst other things, through social distance we might have insights into the concept of ‘equivalence’, and the constraints that social inequalities create in determining the motivations for reciprocation. Following from this, and if kinship decreases or increases subject to social distance, then reciprocity is subject to the same logic, therefore is also fluid. In this sense, Graeber’s term of ‘open’ and ‘closed’ reciprocity is helpful because it implies that a relationship based on ‘open reciprocity’, a relation permeated by ‘permanent mutual commitment’, can also become ‘closed’ when ‘a balancing of accounts closes the relationship off, or at least maintains the constant possibility of doing so’ (Graeber 2001: 220).

The notion of distance regulating reciprocal relationships is of particular relevance in the case of Brazilian migrants since the process of migration shakes the social, the economic and the moral foundations of families and communities. Equally important is the sharing of gifts amongst kin which engenders continuity in the relation (see Sahlins 1972: 208). Migration disrupts these established reciprocal relations which work as a peacekeeping exercise to keep the order and harmony within kinship groups, and these relationships must be re-established every time the migrant returns on holidays. Gifts are, in these occasions, used to respond to the changing circumstances of the migrant and, as Pnina Werbner suggests, ‘rather than disappearing, gift economies

often both effloresce ... and inflate' (1990: 204), but this is not void of tension. During the process of migration and through the distance that such process imposes, forms of reciprocity are rethought and reshaped. Talking about their siblings when they return to Brazil on holidays, two brothers note that: 'when they come over they go out, they buy lots of things, they go out and have fun' (Interview, June 2011), which clearly excludes them. By 'having fun together in the past', the parties were not declaring equivalence, that they could both do something in exactly equal and quantifiable terms, but they were, as Graeber notes, stating that 'they are the same along those dimensions one considers important in that context, and that other possible criteria are, in that context, irrelevant' (Graeber 2001: 223). As such, Graeber continues, 'the element of value ... turns on which criteria are considered meaningful, or important, in any given context' (ibid.). Migration complicates matters insofar as it creates a level of ambivalence between the things that migrants and non-migrants feel that can or cannot, and should or should not be shared and compared, as for example, who pays what and when every time they go out, and how much of the migrant's time spent away socialising with other people measures in relation to time spent with the families. In this sense, what in the past were spontaneous social arrangements which were potentially 'repaid' in other forms are now confined to a new expression of sociality which falls under fixed and quantifiable forms. The point here is not that siblings purposely exclude each other, but rather the fact that they are in a situation where those who remained in Brazil partly feel that they cannot reciprocate in some shape or form, a situation which undermines their previous relationship of presumed equality and closeness. Whilst previously the need to 'keep account' of each contribution was not strictly kept because, as Graeber observes 'the relation is not treated as if it will ever end' (2001: 218), during these times of exception when the migrant returns on holidays, effectively the time for reciprocation is confined to a time span. As the relationship becomes more 'closed', the return of the

migrant is framed within this new premise rather than return to 'what it used to be' pre-migration as many suggest.

As kinship evolves and is reworked organically, non-migrants and migrants adapt and readapt to the different social environments, and reciprocity is worked out within the gaps between the dictums of a new moral compass and the self-interest of the parties, which generates forms of discontent and requires the re-modelling of existing reciprocal relations. Marshall Sahlins asserts:

A systematic relation between reciprocity and sociability in itself does not say when, or even to what extent, the relation will come into play. The supposition here is that the forces of constraint lie outside the relation itself. The terms of final analysis are the larger cultural structure and its adaptive response to its milieu. (1972: 202)

The close-knit of family interaction and support, which includes not only the nuclear family but also extends to other family members as well as non-blood kin, is probably the most central element and the organising principle of Brazilian society (see Korin et al. 2005). Social identity is fundamentally linked to family and social connections and the sense of voluntary-obligation exchange that results from such connections regulates family life and is an important part of a system of reciprocity. Parents and siblings are usually close by to look after their grand-children, nieces and nephews; even with adult and married children, meals are often prepared at the parents' house to enable children to work without having to worry about daily shopping and childcare. As a parent, one is not only expected to support their children but also to look after one's parents in their old age. This system of cooperation, which is perpetuated by the fact that the children who are now in 'debt' to their parents will one day return their parents' efforts, imposes cultural and moral values and plays an important role in the articulation of social order. These commitments cannot be measured or quantified, and therefore there is no concept of equivalence in the interactions, but they obey an internal logic. The moral reasoning behind such relationships are close to what Sahlins calls

‘generalized reciprocity’ (1972: 193), a relationship which does not obey the logical and impersonal transactions that money should create but rather compels us to think about it outside the lenses of credit and debt relationships, at least not in the commonly understood approach that the creditor stands on a higher moral ground whereas the debtor is burdened with the prospect of a repayment in the future. Thus fulfilling social obligations is a moral imperative, not a burden. In that sense, the continuous maintenance of ‘generalized reciprocity’ guarantees a seamless thread between past, present, and future (see Guyer 2004; Hart 2001).

However, this thread is not always easy to negotiate and maintain, and is threatened by the conditions introduced by migration and the wider availability of money. Mirroring kin relations, good social standing is established by gaining others’ respect through the recognition and compliance with values such as honour and trust, and as argued by Korin et al. (2005) not necessarily through personal achievement. This relationship explains why, in their absence from Brazil, the vast majority of the Brazilian migrants in Naas take as their aim not only to improve their lives financially but also to improve that of their parents, in most cases by refurbishing the parents’ house and in others by sending a set monthly amount to their families in Brazil. As Tsuda suggests, these kinds of ‘remittances’ are far from being purely economic transactions, rather they are a ‘form of “symbolic capital” through which migrants abroad express and articulate feelings of familial responsibility and authority and therefore maintain close social and emotional ties with those back home’ (2003: 226-227). The moral obligation towards one’s progenitors has been highlighted as one of the main reasons for the migrant’s return to Brazil, even if return negates their own self-interests.

The same logic that regulates family relations is also visible in neighbourhood interactions. Since access to financial resources in Brazil are scarce -- and as Luis

remembers of a time pre-migration, ‘you earn money during the day, so you can eat in the evening’ (Interview, March 2011) -- pecuniary transactions are often allocated to specific moments, often at the end of the month when the salary is paid. At this point old debts are paid and new credits are made. This is a relationship which is only possible as the owner of money and the seller have common ties to a particular social group, but also because a degree of trust exists that a service will be provided and a price will subsequently be paid at a later stage. The exchange transactions between the neighbourhood shopkeeper and the customer (who tends also to be a neighbour) are therefore not only based on ‘balanced reciprocity’ or pure direct exchange, when a good or service is received and a payment is made without delay. As argued by Rodrigues Guimarães (2007), it is in the neighbourhood that individuals tend to be connected, be it through family, friendships or economic relations. In fact, living in a different neighbourhood, especially if the neighbourhood is geographically distant, is a cause of anxiety and disconnection for families. Vitoria, whose sister lives in a neighbourhood on the other side of town, explains how her sister feels isolated from the rest of the family and limits her visits to her mother and sister to daytime unless her husband drives her to see her family.

The neighbourhood is not only a place to live, but it is a place invested with social and moral relations. With all the financial limitations that Luis and Vitoria see in Brazil, they reflect that Brazilians may not have much money but they find alternative forms which enable them to spend even if that means that they are always in debt:

Before we went to Ireland, one month we paid one bill and would leave another, the following month we would pay the one we didn’t pay the month before so you always left something pending, that way you could reach a balance, so at the end of the day, even if you don’t have money ... you’d still be able to have your *churrasquinho* and be surrounded by family. Because no one has money, everyone goes to the market or to the bar and you buy *fiado* [in ‘good faith’], isn’t it? ... you go and you buy beer on credit. Not having money doesn’t stop you from doing things ... Mr. so and so would make a note in his notebook, for example 10 beers, and coming the end of the month you go back and pay. (Interview, July 2011)

Rodrigues Guimarães (n.d.) notes that within the setting of the neighbourhood, the shopkeeper has, in general, not only an economic relation with his customers but he has familiar and neighbouring relations with his customers, suppliers and other shopkeepers in the area. Since the shopkeeper tends to live in the same neighbourhood, they tend to attend the same functions, their children go to the same schools, they tend to go to the same church; in short they all witness each other's daily life. As such, 'their business is a result of the area they live in and not the other way around' (n.d.: 8).⁵ In that sense, Rodrigues Guimarães (n.d.) notes that the shopkeeper and the customer are not strangers, and a relationship which in principle, given the nature of the exchange, should be impersonal is transformed into something personal, with a 'name, a family, a face and a history'. The local bar in my own neighbourhood in Presidente Epitácio had no name as such, but everyone knew where to go if they were asked to go to Paulo and get a bottle of beer which was often *vendido fiado*, sold in 'good faith', on trust. In that regard, something sold in 'good faith' originates in the nucleus of social relationships which fall in the intervals of sociability that Sahlins (1972) refers to. As Rodrigues Guimarães (n.d.) suggests, this attitude contextualises the individual in the neighbourhood but at the same it also individualises him.

Simmel (2011[1978]) notes that trust always implies a risk, and in the case of the relationship between the shopkeeper/friend and the customer/friend -- a relation which is not absent of hierarchy, Rodrigues Guimarães (n.d.) alerts for the possible risks and conflicts if trust relationships are broken. In case of a debt not paid, that is, if the customer fails to pay what was sold in 'good faith', this is equated to a crime; in that sense 'a person who takes advantage of the shopkeeper's trust is not a debtor, but rather a criminal' (n.d.: 13).⁶ As a result, a relationship which was borne out of fair exchange

⁵ My translation. Original 'O negócio aparece como uma decorrência da residência, e não o contrário'

⁶ My translation. Original 'pessoa que abusa da confiança a ela atribuída pelo comerciante não é devedor, mas criminoso'

is broken. The minding and keeping of this relationship is also important at a level which extends to the economic balance of the neighbourhood. Since it is likely, as Rodrigues Guimarães (n.d.) notes on her study of the place of the local business in the neighbourhood, that the shopkeeper also buys on credit in local shops, his capacity to settle his own accounts largely depends on whether he is being paid or not. Although 'ordinary credit' in local shops is just another layer of social cohesion, and integral payment of debts is not always a necessity, social relations mandate that regular payments are made at the expense of the buyer being considered a 'criminal' by the shopkeeper but also amongst his neighbours and relatives.

When Alice migrated to Ireland her partner had made a number of purchases on credit under her name which he then failed to pay. Faced with a bill she did not know about and a smeared name, one of Alice's main objectives when she emigrated, aside from buying a house, was to pay that outstanding bill and clean her name. Cleaning her name was of paramount importance for Alice as she knew she would, sooner or later, return to Brazil to look after her mother, and without a name that could be trusted in the neighbourhood and in the public sphere she would not be able to rebuild her life upon return. In the light of this, a credit system based on trust is not a credit system of impersonal organizations but is rather a system, based on monetary transactions, which remains deeply embedded in social values of loyalty and responsibility where trust conserves its specific personal character; relationships conserve therefore some of the 'openness' of an 'open-ended' system. In a way, relationships between local shopkeepers and customers are a kind of a kin relation, falling between purely altruistic gift giving and impersonal direct exchange.

The importance of neighbourhood credit-debt dynamics and the moral obligations associated with them are especially important in the context of return migration. In Ireland, Luis and Vitoria got used to something more than earning a

minimum wage and living on small amounts of money, they did not have to pretend that they could afford to buy because they felt they had the means to do so. And, after spending a decade in Ireland where nearly everything that Luis and Vitoria bought was in cash, returning to this rhythm of credit and debt was still difficult to getting used to, as the following quote illustrates:

When we arrived we had to buy a few things ... we checked the amount and, say for example that we're talking about R\$4500 in cash [roughly €1470] and R\$4700 [€1550] on credit ... we had arrived from Ireland and we didn't want to owe anything, so we paid R\$4500 in cash ... whereas no one is ever going to do this in Brazil, they're going to divide it in 17 or 20 instalments ... but then we started thinking about it and do you know what? It actually makes sense because the difference is so small that you get from paying in cash that people prefer to pay small money instead of paying it all in one go ... which leaves more for spending on other things. (Interview, July 2011)

Upon return, migrants who returned in a comfortable financial situation, as opposed to those who returned in precarious conditions, are confronted with circumstances where they do not need a 'good name' to stand on (although this does not mean that they are not going to have a 'good name', it just means that they do not rely on it) because they do not need to buy on credit, but this produces an increased social distance between them and their kin. In an odd turn of events, they do not need a 'good name' at all since they can afford to pay cash. This is problematic since social cohesion is borne and sustained through these important moral and social values, which require high levels of interdependency within the neighbourhood and on the perceived character and the social identity of the parties. Moreover, it also requires trust and 'faith' in the socio-political system; this relationship goes beyond the realm of service-trust. I think that it is perhaps at this point that the complexities of exchange are the most visible, and it becomes more apparent that there is much of the market in gift economies, and much of gift economies in the market.

Simmel suggests that the common relationship between the buyer and the seller, which requires public confidence in the issuing government and confidence that that

same money can be exchanged at a later date at no loss, depends on another additional element, which is ‘most clearly embodied in religious faith’ (2011[1978]: 190). Since the failure of one of these elements is sufficient to cause the credit system to fail, apart from confidence and trust there must exist a degree of ‘faith’ in the socio-political organisation that the market will indeed remain afloat. This degree of ‘faith’ goes beyond the localised sociality of credit and debt in the neighbourhood -- from what in some cases looks like a non-market transaction, and expands into the system of public credit, that is, the customer has faith that his job will be there next month, so he will be able to pay part of his debt, and the shopkeeper has faith that his customer will have a job which will enable him to receive his payment which will then enable him to pay his own creditors. This introduces a new level to the relationship which depends not only on trust, which is a personal relationship, but also on ‘faith’ in the market which is abstract and impersonal. As Karl Marx asserts ‘as with the stroke of an enchanter’s wand, it [public debt which represents the alienation of the state] endows barren money with the power of breeding and thus turns it into capital, without the necessity of its exposing itself to the troubles and risks inseparable from its employment in industry or even in usury’ (2010 [1887]: 529). Like the hunchback in Walter Benjamin’s “Theses of the Philosophy of History” (1969), who, through manoeuvring the strings and through a system of mirrors, created the illusion that the puppet is the one playing chess, resulting in the illusion that the opposing player is playing against the puppet, so too the shopkeeper and the customer know that although they are playing against each other, they must hope and have ‘faith’ in the market to sustain their trust in one another. The introduction of ‘barren money’ which through this relationship can be transformed into capital, poses a threat to neighbourhood and kinship relations. Perhaps David Graeber (2001) is right when he argues that Mauss’s terminology of ‘gift’ and ‘reciprocity’ is helpful when making general moral points about the logic of market exchange, but it is

imprecise when used in cross-cultural comparisons, and suggests that ‘as currently used, “reciprocity” can mean almost anything. It is very close to meaningless’ (2001: 217).

The act of migrating introduces new dimensions to relationships and forces the restructuring of family relations, but also requires a rethinking of the relationship that individuals have with money credit and money proper, as well as with the wider society. Individuals on both sides of the Atlantic get used to their new roles and new situations, until a balance point is found where a new pattern of family interaction can be found and maintained at a distance. Migration forces migrants and their families to found a new equilibrium which becomes the source for new behaviours.

New behaviours are moulded by distance and by the availability of money to migrants. Money enables new forms of association which are not dependent on an investment of personal time and physical proximity to develop, but this does not mean that the introduction of cash transactions correlate with the development of impersonal and unambiguous relations. When money transactions replace credit money and the gift economy, inevitable changes occur between social groups. Simmel (2011[1978]) argues that previous transactions based on personal and unquantifiable interaction give place to a type of promise which is quantifiable, impersonal, and where parties can demand equal quantities (see also Graeber 2012). For Simmel (2011[1978]), money offers individual freedom at the expense of personal values; money brings with it new possibilities and makes choice a reality in an unlimited area, as the value of a particular quantity of money far exceeds the value of the object because of the element of choice that it introduces in the relationship between people, and people and objects. These relationships are not dependent on ‘open-ended’ rights but subjects acquire a level of self-sufficiency which is not dependent on social and moral values. In this regard, the relationship between parties is simplified, completely objective and is only embodied in money. Simmel further argues that in the light of this, money, as ‘means’ to achieve a

purpose, leads to individual freedom, but insists that for those with less money to spend ‘these resources are not simply ‘means’ at their disposal in the same pure and abstract sense as they are for the rich, because the purpose is already embedded in them and colours and directs them’ (2011[1978]: 236). For those like Vitoria, whose salary’s expenditure was already allocated even before the salary itself had been paid, hence tied to a specific purpose, ‘every expenditure is unavoidably burdened with the thought of the required costs’ (ibid.).

Although I largely agree with Simmel’s argument that money helps to remove ‘feelings of affliction’ and sets the path for individual freedom, I part with him on what he suggests is the heartlessness of money. Money is not only a means of exchange or a measure of value, and it does not have to be the cause of lukewarm relationships between people who once were close. As asserted by Bill Maurer, ‘it is not clear that money always flattens social relations, rather than creating new ones just as complex’ (2006: 21). In the case of Brazilians migrants, their relationships with their kin and with the objects of their desires have indeed been changed by the introduction of the availability of money, but have not necessarily been simplified by it; if anything it has introduced new complexities.

Discussions about modern money have often ended by suggesting that the cash economy leads to an impoverished form of social contract (see Mauss 2011). Marx (2010[1887]) and Simmel (2011[1978]) reflect on the concept of modern money as a universal measure through which workers relate to the product of their labour, and to the world around them. For Marx, money is a ‘privileged commodity’ to the extent that ‘the congelations of human labour embodied in all other commodities come to express their values in it’ (Hutchinson 1996: 58). As the labour process distances the worker from the fruit of their labour, money leads to the objectification of human relations and culminates in the alienation between the subject and the object, and ultimately between

individual themselves. These discussions reveal a preoccupation with a world that has been lost. For Simmel, on the other hand, money leads to individual freedom albeit with the caveat that it leaves individuals with nothing else through which to relate to the world. Moreover, through money people move away from spirituality and contemplation. Thus, the increase in individual freedom happens at the expense of social cohesion. Ultimately, money is seen to erode sociability and to introduce a degree of violence into relationships between people, because according to Graeber, 'money has no essence' (2012: 372), and money exchange renders the social identities of the parties irrelevant.

Though money arrangements are framed through the language of morality, honour and solidarity have largely been removed from the marketplace (see Graeber 1996; 2012). Graeber further argues that the immorality of money, a promise converted into mathematics, makes quantification possible only through the introduction of violence in the relationship. But, in *Towards an Anthropological Theory of Value - The False Coin of Our Own Dreams*, Graeber had already warned against 'romanticizing 'the gift' as a humanizing counterweight to the impersonality and social isolation of modern capitalist society' (Graeber 2011: 226). Social analysis brings to daylight the indeterminacy and the openness of money, as Maurer suggests, because 'money may render everything calculable, but the systems of calculation and quantifications on which it depends are not always as straightforwardly algebraic as one might imagine' (Maurer 2006: 23).

Anthropologists have inquired into different regimes of value, regimes which question the straight forward opposition between money as impersonal and quantifiable, and the gift as personal and intangible. Viviana A. Zelizer (1989; 1994) in her analysis of 'special moneys' suggests that money does indeed transform relationships but, in the process, money is also transformed. Whilst the utilitarian understanding of money

portrays market exchange as free from cultural and social constraints, Zelizer notes that money may well belong to the market but it is not exclusive to it. In fact, money, Zelizer suggests, is ‘neither culturally neutral nor morally invulnerable’ (1989: 347) and whilst it is acknowledged that money transforms the relationships between people, it should also not be forgotten that values and feelings at the heart of relationships will also invest money with moral meaning. This moral question is also discussed by Christopher C. Taylor in his ethnography *Milk, Money and Honey*, where he traces the historical transition of a gift-to-commodity transformation (1992; Saris 2000; Hutchinson 1996). Here Taylor discusses the effects of being caught between two standards of morality, between a more communally oriented form of life and a life where the role of money introduces alternative notions of freedom and modernity (1992: 125ff). In general, for Brazilian migrants, money earned abroad frees them from many of their social obligations and from forms of reciprocity that largely dictate that their own interests should come second to the interests of the group. As such, money liberates and affords personal freedom but increases social distance which creates a whole new range of problems of its own. In the light of this, as Taylor (1992: 201) avers, both the gift and the commodity should be treated as ‘total social phenomena’ precisely because ‘new meanings grow out of the ways people use old symbols to “recognize” new social situations’ (211). This recognition is not always seamless as Jamie Saris observes (2000: 697), pointing to the limitations of dividing the ‘traditional from the modern’ without accounting for the local complexities that sustain life. These complex notions of ‘tradition’ and ‘progress’ are visible in the valuations that Brazilian migrants make of the houses they are building in Brazil.

As discussed earlier, the main aim of virtually every Brazilian in Naas when emigrating to Ireland was to buy a house of their own in Presidente Epitácio. Had they stayed in Brazil they would have, more likely than not, been able to buy a house there,

but this would have taken years. Many of the migrants who emigrated during the first and the second wave have been able to buy and to build their own house in Brazil. These houses are however very different from the houses of non-migrants, not only in terms of the financial investment in the house itself which has become a visible evidence of the migrant's success, but also in the process through which said houses are built. In general, when someone builds a house, the individual has a direct and hands-on involvement with the property, in many cases raising the house with one's own hands. As such, the person will in many cases move into the house when the house is still in its final stage of completion rather than waiting for it to be completely finished. This process, the financial sacrifice and the personal investment into the object, ultimately means that a sentiment of value is attached to it, and each stage of construction is an elaborate and complex process, always in change and adjustment (Simmel 2011[1978]).

When examining the threads that stitch relations between objects and subjects in a context of fast changing social and cultural realities, Brad Weiss, when considering Haya understandings of money, argues that paying attention to notions of bodiliness 'permit us to explore the connections between objectification and embodiment' (1997: 339) and shed light on processes of valuation. In that sense, building a house with one's own hands is directly connected with the house itself, which problematises social integrity as, as Sayad notes, the opportunities for economic progress seem 'illegitimate' because they were not recognised as being within socially accepted norms (1999: 116). Thus, what this valuation also points to is the fact that building a house in Brazil is not only a question of money or physical presence, but as Weiss observes 'the real value of money, the grounds against which transformations in monetary values may be gauged, always lies in the past.' (1997: 349), and yet the distinctive ways to money valuations 'must be linked to the kinds of practices ... in which these distinctively valued currencies are engaged' (353).

Since migrants lack the proximity that this process requires, they either opt for buying a house which they then rent out as an investment, never abandoning however the aim of building their own house when they return to Brazil, or decide to build at a distance. Much like the ‘Sterling houses’ described by Watson (1975) in Hong Kong, which were built by money earned in the United Kingdom, houses bought to be rented out are practical investments that assure the migrant’s future stability in Brazil upon their return and they also represent an additional source of income for those who remain in Ireland. The houses bought to be rented out have become increasingly relevant in the past few years as migrants decide to stay in Ireland. One couple who had been building their house in Brazil with the hope to move back when it was finished, have recently decided to postpone their return and rent out their newly built house for R\$1,600. This additional income has important consequences to their lives in Ireland since with the rent money from the house in Brazil the family is able to rent a house in Ireland which will enable them to live as a nuclear family for the first time in their lives without having to share accommodation with other family members. The initial goal of building a house was never to rent it out as there is much pride and joy in moving into a brand new house. But as circumstances change, these houses become sources of income rather than sources of happiness.

Regardless of renting or building, these houses tend to be managed by their parents or siblings in Brazil. One migrant in particular has been building his house for the past number of years, the house has been recently finished, but he has never seen it except in photographs. He imagines what the house looks like, what it is like inside, but he has never seen it; his father-in-law is managing the construction site and the financial resources sent from Ireland.

One can easily be forgiven for siding with Marx and thinking that such alienation between subject and object is a consequence of the level of objectivity and

impersonality that money affords. However, this is not the case. Migrants do not feel alienated from their possessions as they feel that they have contributed to it by sacrificing not their time building the house but rather with a particular form of sacrifice which is not easily visible for those in Brazil. The sacrifice is illustrated by the sharing of accommodation in Ireland, especially for couples, which is an element of life that remains invisible, although not hidden, to their families and friends in Brazil. This self-imposed sacrifice is only justified by the impact that a lower rent will have on the migrants' remittances and ultimately on the achievement of their financial goal in Brazil. For most, the house in Ireland is a place to 'pass through' but never a place to make one's own. This state of permanent unsettledness to live a private life in one's own house creates a feeling often identified as a 'lack of freedom', but on the other hand it adds value to the sacrifice and to the financial achievements in Brazil. Equally, the sacrifice made in Ireland is 'repaid' in Brazil through the recognition of achievement by other migrants and non-migrants (see Hutchinson 1996: 93).

Nevertheless, what is important here is that money alone and the self-sufficiency that it affords could not have created a radically different relationship with the object. It is through the possibilities that money affords that the relationships with families and relatives are maintained and perpetuated. Thus, as Hutchinson (1996: 89) notes, the social principles characteristic of kinship exchange are drawn into the marketplace and vice versa. As such, relationships can also flow through money, even if this does not happen without creating new levels of complexity. In her ethnography *Nuer Dilemmas* Hutchinson (1996) argues that men and women fuse the concepts of cattle and money in order to enable market valuations to enter bridewealth exchange without threatening social life; analogously, so too migrants and non-migrants incorporate a wider availability of money into their relationships without necessarily threatening the fundamental values through which relationships are maintained. The same principle that

guides 'generalized reciprocity' and which create social bonds remains active here. For example, parents often manage the construction and the migrant's property portfolio without asking for remuneration in return as this would go contrary to established parent-child dynamic. However, a 'payment', in cash or in the form of gifts sent from Ireland, which may vary in amount and in frequency, is often given to family members as a sign of recognition, but not as payment. As one migrant puts it:

You need someone there [in Brazil] to help you ... because there is too much bureaucracy ... it's difficult, I tried to do it and it didn't work, because you need someone to manage your bank account, or if you want to make an investment you need someone there to manage things for you ... but another thing, you need to trust the people and believe that they're going to do the right thing ... because we're talking about something that you fought for and you don't want to lose it, do you understand? You are far away, you're sacrificing a lot, but if the person is your father or your sister ... I have all the trust in them. (Interview, May 2011)

Svendsen avers that people who trust one another can interact with less hindrance than those who interact in a climate of mistrust, 'where a considerable apparatus of formal regulations and contracts has to be in place. To quote Fukuyama, we can say that mistrust increases human 'transaction costs'' (Svendsen 2008: 97). Trust becomes more relevant as social situations become more complex, in which case trust is an important form of 'social capital' (Fukuyama cited in Svendsen 2008). Of course, trust does not always have to be something good, especially in the case of migrants who travelled during the third wave at the advice of their family members and who found themselves in situations of irregularity in Ireland. This is to be discussed at a later stage.

The significance of money cannot, in my view, be analysed in isolation from all the other social interactions. In that sense, money is not always heartless but can serve to perpetuate existing arrangements between people. Keith Hart suggests that money's significance 'lies in the synthesis it promotes of impersonal abstraction and personal meaning. ... its social power comes from the fluency of its mediation between infinite

potential and finite determination' (Hart 2007: 15). Money itself may be impersonal but as soon as it takes part in personal relations, such as between kin, it becomes personal as well.

For migrants, the availability of money on a daily basis seems to create a sense of freedom and self-sufficiency which unburden the individual from the pressures of human and financial resource management. A common trend amongst Brazilians in Naas is a sense of gratitude towards 'Ireland' and the possibilities and economic progress that working in Naas has presented them with. Many migrants, especially those who emigrated during the first and the second wave, have often pointed out that economic progress has only been possible to them through migration. However, this sense of gratitude is immediately overshadowed by the remark that in 'Ireland there is no freedom'. Whilst money may provide migrants with various degrees of individual freedom and self-sufficiency, the familiarity gained by understanding and navigating the social and cultural conventions in Ireland is absent. The distance from a familiar social milieu and the lack of familiarity with cultural norms that give meaning to daily living creates a sense of un-freedom. This is the conundrum at the heart of the return question, that is, whether to remain in Ireland, return to Brazil, or re-emigrate; or to put it more bluntly, the choice between money, individual freedom and unfamiliarity, or familiarity and solidarity (although less individual freedom) with no money. Lucas illustrates this very clearly:

In Brazil YOU WORK ... because in Ireland you work very little, I think, that's my view, right? In comparison to Brazil you don't work much ... but in Brazil you don't earn what you should ... in relation to the amount of work you put in ... you earn the essential, so much so that you must know how to earn and how to spend ... but there are many in Ireland who [in comparison] spend more there than those who are here ... if they were here they'd have a better life, because here you're in your country, you speak your language, you have friends, you need help and you ask a neighbour, it's different from there [Ireland], there no one helps anyone, not that they don't want to help, but there everyone lives their own life, isn't it? It's different. (Interview, July 2011)

Here the pros and cons of life in Ireland and life in Brazil start to be placed on the different sides of the weighing scale. And Lucas goes on:

I'm not saying that people there don't help, they do, but the thing is that life there is the same for everyone, everyone has a job, it's all more or less the same thing, everyone has a salary, everyone gets paid the same day, isn't it? There, that's the way equality is. So if you approach someone and say: "hey, could you lend me some money", I would ask: "why do you need help and I don't?" isn't it? It's different, "I have and you don't. Why do I have and you don't? What did you do that now you have got nothing left knowing that we both work and earn the same?" (Interview, July 2011)

To a certain extent, life in Ireland helps to dilute some of the socioeconomic differences that might have been more visible in Brazil, and a form of social equality emerges during the process of migration and amongst the immigrant community (see Tsuda 2003: 177). Paradoxically, this social equality develops at the expense of mutual help because, as Lucas puts it in quite a matter of fact manner, if everyone earns the same, then, not being able to get to the end of the month or not being able to save speaks more of character than it speaks of the quantity of money itself.

In that sense, the availability of money introduces new complexities in the relationships amongst migrants but also between migrants and non-migrants, and these complexities require, amongst other things, that one becomes familiarized with the intricacies of new rules of moral reasoning, what is appropriate to give and what is appropriate to ask for in return, as well as to be able to evaluate and calculate investments in relationships in a social context which is developing at a distance (see Strathern 2012; Gregory 2012).

We should refrain from thinking about the introduction of these new developments as a threat to established social interactions, that is, no more so as the introduction of any other external element, or as a displacement and dissolution of blood, kinship or loyalty ties. The availability of money seems to create dissatisfaction, a dissatisfaction which was inexistent before because the possibility to be dissatisfied

did not exist. Migrants frequently mention the lack of freedom in Ireland associated with the weather that prevents them from socialising outdoors without having to spend money. If they want to organise a game of volleyball this requires preparation, the renting of a suitable gym, which costs money and is less spontaneous. In that sense, life in Ireland introduces an additional level in the achievement of a specific purpose, and ‘doing things in common with others becomes the typical relationship of objects in a money economy because all things are connected by means of money as though a central station’ (Simmel 2011[1978]: 424). Because of the additional pressure that these new sets of circumstances create whereby leisure is mediated by the availability of money, money becomes a purpose in itself. The growing significance of money suggests an increasing ‘rejection and negation of the end’ (Simmel 2011[1978]: 525). Whilst in Brazil social life is inexpensive and spontaneous, social life in Ireland is expensive and requires a good deal of planning (except if window shopping); in Ireland money is at the centre of any meaningful social life outside the house. On the one hand the additional expense that enables Brazilians to have a fulfilling social life outside the house clashes with the main goal of saving money, and on the other it clashes with traditional and accustomed patterns of sociability of spontaneous and inexpensive social life. All of this culminates with the very tangible feeling that social life in Ireland shrinks. The topic of consumption will be developed later, but here it suffices to clarify that whereas in Ireland window shopping is accepted as a new form of social activity, this is not always the case in Brazil.

When migrants return to Brazil on holidays they experience a world where the availability of money earned in Ireland momentarily coexists with Brazilian social life and family obligations. These two worlds, often separated by the distance between Ireland and Brazil, collide, and many speak about the time spent on holidays in Brazil as making them feel as if surrounded by an ‘armour’, a kind of shield, that protects them

from the worries and hardships of life; and that armour is money. Levels of spending when migrants go to Presidente Epitácio on holidays are indicative of the obligations regulating family and social life, but they also require a fine balancing act between the migrant's own personal needs and the relative's expectations. As Ruba Salih (2001) observes, many migrants struggle to distribute and find that balancing point whereby their resources are managed in such a way that they respond to both the desire to display their success achieved through migration and the concrete requirement of daily living. Many Brazilian migrants speak about their first visit to Brazil, usually after one year working in Ireland, when they lavished their families and relatives with gifts, and invited friends to drink and eat out in town. One couple noted, 'the first time we went to Brazil [on holidays] we spent R\$18.000 [nearly €5.800], but the following times we planned it and we spent less than R\$4.000.' (Interview, May 2011)

In a context where, in the early 2000s, most of their workmates in Brazil earned less than the current R\$1,200 per month, this level of spending 'shielded' migrants, as Luis puts it, from the daily hardships of living a life of indebtedness and monthly instalments, and created an imaginary scenario where money and social obligations could merge. Many speak about their experiences when going to the bank to deal with their affairs, and how they would receive special treatment by the bank manager because they 'work abroad'. Another couple highlights, 'in 3 weeks I spent R\$9,000, in Brazil it would have taken me years to save R\$9,000' (Interview, December 2010). Their parents' house, where most would stay during their visit to Brazil, would constantly be full of people who would have heard that they had returned on holidays and would come to say hello. Vitoria recalls how sometimes she 'didn't even know them and people would offer me money to bring them to Ireland' (Interview, June 2011). The levels of monetary extravagance are in many ways unsuitable for the migrant's circumstances as is pointed out by other migrants.

Simmel argues that because of the close relationship with money, extravagance ‘robs those who are subject to it of all reasonable standards, since the regulation that is given through the measure of receptivity of concrete objects is lacking’ (2011[1978]: 268). The spendthrift gains a place in the social imaginary as an individual who has lost all sense of value due to the amounts of money at his or her disposal, and on the other hand it reinforces the superiority of money expressed in the act of extravagance. The fact that money is not associated with specific purposes, such as those seen earlier, suggests that money as quantity also earns ‘for those people who are only interested in money the quality of characterlessness’ (Simmel 2011[1978]: 232). Abdelmalek Sayad (1999: 34) makes a similar point about the ‘good’ emigrant who is praised because he is capable of preserving his ‘authentic’ identity, that is, his ‘character’, despite his ‘new emigrant condition’ acquired through a wider access to money, and so the migrant proves that he has not been corrupted by money and his loyalties remain to his kin. As, Sayad notes:

The most unexpected effect of emigration seems to have been a blurring of the boundaries between social groups and of the boundaries of the social hierarchy. This is because it gives emigrants the opportunity and the social means to achieve a promotion that inevitably seems ‘illegitimate’ because it has been acquired outside the socially accepted norms, and outside the orthodoxy that governs even the most accelerated and total (i.e. revolutionary) social transformations. (1999: 116)

This window into the migrants’ lives when they are on holidays which is not representative of their own lives in Ireland, and which they will not be able to maintain upon return, changes the perceptions that non-migrants have of migrants which renders the latter as *metido*, self-absorbed and conceited. Migrants themselves, and their families, would vehemently dispute this and suggest that they ‘are the same person’, that they are, in fact, keeping what Simmel calls a ‘functional distance’ (2011[1978]: 518). Simmel notes that modern man would ‘sink completely into despair if the objectification of social relationships did not bring with it an inner boundary and

reserve' (ibid.). It is this 'reserve' which is interpreted as characterless. It seems to me that a 'functional distance' works as a protection mechanism, a protection from being asked to bring other people to Ireland, from being asked to lend money, and I would suggest a protection from seeing the circumstances that used to be their own reality. Conserving a 'functional distance' is also, I believe, a way of protecting the veneer of what life really is like in Ireland, 'Yes', some would say, 'in Ireland you find money, although less than before, but there is also sharing accommodation, there is loneliness, there is not being able to communicate in English'; in other words, distance obscures the fact that life in Ireland is not without its difficulties. And perhaps, distance prevents others from asking them when they will return to Brazil and about their financial achievements. Keeping a distance is to conserve the individual freedom conquered in Ireland. In a way, as Taylor notes, in order to 'accumulate commodity wealth, one must block certain avenues of gift exchange, in particular, those avenues that do not bring personal profit' (1992: 13).

The dynamic between money as the means to individual freedom, and money as unable to pay moral obligations towards a particular social group curtails the migrant's choices of return. Return is constantly pondered between these two elements; on the one hand migrants have been introduced to earning and having money available every week or every fortnight, and have become very familiar with the fact that money 'obeys without reservation' but at the same time money is worth less because it cannot repair the disruption of relationships. In that sense, and similar to what has been noted by Margolis (1994), Korin et al. (2005), and Torresan (2011) the financial opportunities offered by the act of migration are offset by the loss of a particular form of sociability which migrants' have left behind and are unable to reproduce in Ireland, but which they continue to long for.

Many migrants reflect on the irreparable loss of losing their parents while in Ireland, and on the disruption of family. Women in particular, speak about the distance created by time spent away from their husbands and the emotional strain on their children when the father emigrates. Some children start wetting the bed and getting behind in school, and mothers often find themselves dealing with their children's temporary loss of their father and their own temporary loss of their husband. One woman summarises the challenges of the reunification of children with their fathers, and wives with their husbands in these terms 'it takes time to get used to the person again, you lose intimacy' (Interview, April 2011). And another woman complains that her husband has returned to Brazil and to his family with the mindset of a single man, that is, spending time with his friends instead of spending time with his family. At the same time, money introduces a level of easiness in everyday life whereby, as Vitoria clearly illustrates, 'you put your head on the pillow and you sleep ... without worrying about bills to pay'. (Interview, June 2011)

During the period that the nuclear family is apart, spouses' relationships are deeply marked by distance and rumours of infidelity. The 'network of gossip', as some women called it, circulates quickly between Ireland and Brazil and many believe that this is the source of many broken marriages. Many other marriages break up due to the distance and the time spent apart. Ronaldo, who emigrated in 2002 and who is now divorced from his then wife, puts it in these terms:

The money that I earned in Ireland was good ... it's money that if I had to work here in Brazil I would have to work for a long time. One year that I worked there is the equivalent to 6 or 7 years here in Brazil, right? Money that I would have earned working in the same position that I had there, so the money was good; but on the other hand it wasn't good because my family disintegrated, right? The majority of Brazilians who have a family and who didn't take their family [to Ireland], almost all lost their families, lost like, I mean, separated. (Interview, July 2011)

Many migrants made a decision to keep their families in Brazil as this would enable them to save more money and return sooner, and others because since their spouses would not automatically be entitled to work in Ireland bringing them and their children over would constitute a hard blow to the household budget which ultimately would result in less money saved and in the increase of time away from Brazil. And Ronaldo continues:

The family situation was finished, there was no way back, at the end of the day the money that I earned Ireland ... it almost wasn't worthwhile because after you separate you have to divide, isn't it? So, I stayed as I was before. (Interview, July 2011)

The expression that 'one year in Ireland equates to 7 years in Brazil' comes up frequently in conversations, and suggests that what drove Brazilians to Ireland was what one of Margolis' informants called the 'economy of time' (1994: 75), that is, the possibility of compressing in a shorter amount of time the earnings which would otherwise take years to be achieved. Through an economy of time, the previously remote objects such as a house, the capital to invest in business, or a car come closer to the migrant. However, as Simmel notes 'the most remote comes closer at the price of increasing the distance to what was originally nearer' (2011 [1978]: 517). In the case of migrants whose family ties have dissolved in the process of migration, the price paid for financial progress was an increase in the emotional distance between the family members. The more the distance between the subject and the object shrinks, the more the distance between the family members increases. Simmel (2011[1978]) suggests that distance between subject and object is conquered through money and the dual role it plays in this dual process of pulling apart and coming together, the first with people and the latter with objects. He further argues that the loosening of the family ties 'has its origin in the special economic interests of its individual members, which is possible only in a money economy' (Simmel 2011[1978]: 517). I disagree with the view that this

is the result of a situation based completely on individual money, talents and freedoms, but money introduces other considerations in the relationships as, as discussed earlier, its availability requires new ways to evaluate and calculate the investment that each party makes to the relationship.

For Simmel (2011[1978]), the relative element of financial progression overlooks the significance of the absolute goals in life. He suggests that each 'epoch' has its own rhythms which satisfy basic needs for 'diversity and regularity, change and stability' (2011[1978]: 527), and this regular and rhythmic repetition produces reassurance. Migration changes the beat through which the rhythm of life was lived. This rhythmical sound is very obvious for both migrants and non-migrants. Migrants often talk about the fact that they can afford to buy clothes and other non-essential goods on a daily basis in Ireland whereas in Brazil they would have to plan for it. A family member of a migrant illustrates this when reflecting that their relatives in Ireland have, or at least she believes they have, access to all they want, and whenever they want:

There they can buy whatever they want, they can buy nice things, whatever they want, they have money to eat expensive things, they can go to the cinema as many times as they want, they can go shopping ... and here you can't, because you have a certain salary and you must learn how to live with it, like we do. Do you see us going shopping? Do you see us going out to eat every weekend? Why don't we do that? Because we don't have the money to do that. (Interview, June 2011)

Her life on the other hand follows a different pace:

I can't buy everything that I want ... I don't have enough money ... sometimes I see a pair of shoes and I don't have the money to go there and get them, because the money that I have, I have to think of my children, there's always something they need ... so, I don't have the money, for example "Ah, I wanted to go shopping", no, ... I can't spend because there is something else that needs to be paid, do you understand? ... there isn't any spare money, everything has to be very well managed. (Interview, June 2011)

It is true that in Ireland many migrants have found individual freedom through wider access to money proper, but it is also true that in this new relationship, brothers and sisters, cousins, aunts, uncles, neighbours, all become one step removed from their previous status within the kinship system. Similar to Arensberg's analysis of the impact of marriage on siblings and the family structure, here too siblings become 'friends' (1988: 84). Two brothers talk about it in these terms:

First brother: I'm hopeful that we will...

Second brother: that we will be a united family, isn't it?

First brother: I'm not going to say that we will be the way we were before, but I'm hopeful that, like, on mother's day, every other year, we will spend it with our mother, that on her birthday we'll get together, everyone, and meet at her house, I'm hopeful that things will be like this. (Interview June 2011)

The rupture in the worldview between migrants and non-migrants is not, in my view, caused by money as such but is the consequence of a change of pace in their lives which money enables. Migrants often talk about the fact that in Ireland they are paid fortnightly which in their view means that they can afford to spend since one 'always has money' and the next salary is only two weeks away. Women in particular who work as cleaners in private houses are paid nearly every day and so they usually have money on a consistent and daily basis as opposed to Brazil where they could spend the last two weeks of the month with no money at all. Interestingly this point is commented on whereas the fact that the salary in Ireland is higher is not. It is the pace rather than the amount that is remarked upon. It is the possibility rather than the objective action that becomes centre stage, the possibility to buy anything at anytime for money, and so 'the emotions and stimulation of the individual need no longer to cling to a rhythm that would enforce a periodicity in order to satisfy them' (Simmel 2011[1978]: 529).

The economy of time creates a new sequence of rhythms, which shorten the distance between the migrants' will and the ability to reach the objects of their desires, and creates a sense of evenness that overcomes the irregularities and anxieties of a life

where money is less available. But the economy of time comes at the expense of emotional distance, and in many respects these two elements confront the migrant and their return to Brazil. Lucas notes:

Here [in Ireland] we're never completely happy. Here we have a very good life, comfort, everything, but there is always something missing, I can't tell you what but it's as if we had no freedom, the things that we like to do in Brazil, the things that really make us happy, that we cannot find here. Here we find money, not much but enough to live a comfortable life. Friends, but you don't feel that affection that you felt for friends in Brazil; there is some family but not many, so we feel, we miss something closer to us. Here is a bit distant, I can't tell you exactly. (Interview, December 2010)

The economy of time and the choices and the possibilities that it enables also crystallizes the relativity of money and the absoluteness of what was the essence of their lives before migration. Considering this, migrants, and by the same token non-migrants, look upon their lives in Ireland as advancing in some ways and receding in others, almost as if two parallel sequences of time run concurrently but never touching. For Alice, remaining in Ireland felt like she was wasting her time. As time elapses, the distance between these two lines increases and the hope that they might, one day, touch becomes more and more unrealistic.

As argued earlier, what motivated Brazilian migrants from Presidente Epitácio to Naas in Ireland was not a conscious and rational decision, nor was the conclusion of an expressed desire to emigrate. Rather migration happened as a possibility, the result of a number of circumstances. The majority of migrants were employed when they emigrated, they were generally in their 20s and 30s and either single or with young families. According to them, the only thing missing in life as they knew it then was a house of their own. Thus, the vast majority of migrants left their hometown in Brazil for one reason and one reason only, to earn enough money to buy a house.

Migration policy tends to freeze migrants in this first instance of the migration process and to fix their personal histories in this point in time. The contributions that

migrants make, as discussed before, are often thought of in economic terms and their return as a personal choice. However, migration does not allow the economic being to travel and the emotional being to stay behind. Return is never fully personal because it remains embedded in social webs of decision-making, and responds to obligations in the country of origin. Even when migrants have been introduced to money proper in a quantity that they were unfamiliar with, money becomes part of the relationships already in existence. In that sense money is not merely a means of exchange or a measure of value, but is also personal because it aggregates its calculability and its impersonal characteristics, with the personal aspects embedded in human and kinship transactions. There is no doubt that money changes migrants' relationships with their families, friends and neighbours in Brazil. For the first time in their lives, having money on a consistently and daily basis is a reality, and this changes and expands their vision in relation to the wider possibilities in life. Lucas summarises this in these terms:

I think I won in life: I have learnt how to live, to enjoy myself now. I never had access to anything, so I learnt how to fight for something better ... [in Ireland] I opened my mind, I would never had done anything like this, travelling and seeing other things if I had stayed in Brazil. Before, I would have been happier with much less. Now I think I never have enough. (Interview, December 2010)

Buying a house becomes an objective amongst others such as saving money for a second or third house, a car, or to invest in their own business (see Margolis 1994; Tsuda 2003). For these reasons it can be said that money changes social relations and introduces new complexities into relationships, but these changes have never been suggested as being negative. Rather, they are articulated in positive form and followed by a 'but'.

As discussed earlier, time must run its course 'till the action resolves itself in the crystallization of a new situation'. The economy of time runs at the pace of two different sequences constantly drifting apart. On the one thread there is money with its expanding properties which enables migrants to acquire in one year what would

otherwise take them seven; on the other the regressive properties that widens the gap between them and the social life they knew before but which create new ways of being in the world. The act of migrating introduces new dimensions to relationships and forces the restructuring of family and kinship relations. It also requires a rethinking of the relationship that individuals have with money credit and money proper, as well as with the wider society. Migrants have always remarked to me that when they return ‘everything will be as it was before,’ and life will just be picked up where it was left of, with the additional advantage of financial stability. In that respect, non-migrants are considerably more aware of the challenges that return migrants face, and that they themselves face in their relationships with their family members who emigrated. As some migrants decide to re-emigrate to Ireland, in general after spending a period of one year in Brazil, these challenges are becoming even more obvious to non-migrants, and are received with a pinch of concern from migrants in Ireland.

CHAPTER 3

For sale: from citizenship to shoes

Earlier I discussed the introduction of wider access to money proper in the lives of Brazilian migrants to Ireland, and have suggested that the disruption in the worldview between migrants and non-migrants is not caused by money *per se*, but is the consequence of a change of pace in their lives which money enables. I have also argued that the process of migration offered, according to migrants themselves, the opportunity to earn in one year what otherwise would have taken them seven in Brazil. The relationship illustrated by the time that takes to earn money in Brazil and the time that it takes to earn it in Ireland is often indirectly articulated as something ‘supra-natural’, in that Ireland becomes what many migrants have called a ‘mother’ who gives unconditionally beyond herself. Additionally, Ireland stands for what is modern, clean and ordered, and is able to give beyond what would have been possible in Brazil, by means that are not fully clear to migrants. It is this experience of an alternative form of modernity which migrants come to experience in Ireland as temporal difference. The aim in this chapter is not to explore the universal concept of time, or the direction that the study of time has taken in anthropology, but to explore the responses that Brazilians give to the time ‘gained’ in Ireland, which can potentially translate into money, through the process of migration, which coupled with a certain experience of modernity acquires temporal meaning.

‘I believe life in Brazil will be good for those who used their time in Ireland wisely. For those who knew what to do with the money they earned, they will have a certain comfort in Brazil’ (Interview, December 2010). Lucas tells me that in Ireland he had a good wage, but he was also careful on how he spent it. He had no debts and he avoided partying or excessive shopping, and this is the reason why he has been able to return to Brazil in a comfortable financial situation. Mostly, Lucas believes that luck strikes only once and if one misses that opportunity others might come along but that one is gone forever. To exemplify his way of thinking he gives me this example:

You know, it's like people trying to recover what they have misspent, whatever you've lost cannot be recovered, for example if you have a work commitment at a certain time, say it's at 7 o'clock and you woke up at 7.10, you are already 10 minutes late, so there's no point in running, because that time is lost, lost, you can't recover that ... you might run to work ... you might finish 10 minutes later ... but those initial 10 minutes are lost ... So if you lost what you have saved [or the chance to save it] you won't recover it. (Interview, July 2011)

The implication is that time is precious and individual, and whilst time might be used to compensate for other people's loses, for example in the case of an employer whose employee is late by ten minutes and who finishes ten minutes later, personal time is less forgiving and an opportunity lost is really lost. Similar to Lucas, Luis and Vitoria are also conscious that if they were able to save and invest in Brazil -- so they could enjoy life upon their return without having to think and worry about money, is because they lived a fairly austere life in Ireland, and suggest that many who did not have the same will-power are now in a situation when after living over a decade in Ireland they have not been able to save and invest in Brazil. For Luis and Vitoria it was a question of priorities as they clearly point out:

Some spent first and saved later, do you understand? And we did the opposite, we saved first ... and it was only after we had conquered all these things that we said "now, we're going to travel", and we started spending ... but many people spent, spent, spent and said "in a few years I'll start saving" and then things went downhill in Ireland, and today there's no way you can save money, those people were left behind. (Interview, July 2011)

It is only those who have saved first who were then able to invest in Brazil, and Luis and Vitoria feel that for those who spent first and saved later, in other words those who did not know how to use their time wisely, returning to Brazil is highly unlikely because facing their return to Brazil ten years older and without a job, a house and without savings, is social and financial suicide. When reflecting on their return or potential return to Brazil, migrants assess their time in Ireland by looking at their personal achievements, often measured through an opportunity-cost retroactive exercise, and by reflecting on collective representations of time such as, for example

when stating that someone is 'left behind'. By combining these two approaches, the use of time 'gained' in Ireland comes to be seen as a sign of wisdom when the opportunities for financial progression were multiplied, or of foolishness if time in Ireland is considered to have been 'wasted'. For Brazilian migrants, the inability of some to 'save first, and spend later' represents not only the loss of the potential money which could have been saved but also the loss of time and the opportunity itself.

Time is one of those concepts so simple that it can often be locked in sentences like 'time passes', and at the same time so complex that it is nearly better to leave it alone because it is, at least in my mind, nearly impossible to make any kind of coherent and rational argument without getting in trouble half way through with all sorts of contradictions. Anthropologists have been debating time since Émile Durkheim first proposed that time belongs not only in the realm of philosophical discussion but is also a social concept which must be discussed in the light of the means through which societies codify it and, as Alfred Gell suggests, Durkheim raises 'the much more problematic issue of how it comes about that time exists to be codified' (1992: 6). Thinking about time as something which is socially derived paved the way for anthropologists like Evans-Pritchard to provide accounts of collective representations of time. Evans-Pritchard (1939; 1940) in his study of the Nuer, distinguishes between two time movements: 'oecological, or occupational ... and a structural, or moral' time (1939: 190) and emphasises the link between social factors and temporality. The author further argues that for the Nuer, 'all time is structural since it is a conceptualization of collateral, co-ordinated, or co-operative activities: the movements of a group' (1940: 104). For Evans-Pritchard the Nuer have no concept of abstract time and for this reason they had not developed a system of calculating time as something 'which passes, can be wasted, can be saved' (1939: 208). Hence, for the Nuer, Evans-Pritchard argues, time is 'motionless', and temporal concepts do not have a

corresponding measure with other forms of calculating time in other societies, since for the Nuer time is 'relations between activities' (Evans-Pritchard 1940: 103) which may be absent in other cultural contexts. But Alfred Gell (1992) rightly points out that although time may be understood differently, it is nonetheless misleading to assume that the Nuer lack the concept of duration. I think Geertz's (1973) analysis of "Person, Time, and Conduct in Bali" is instructive here in arguing for the universality of concepts such as time even if its definition is dependent on the ways through which human experience is organised. Time is then understood as a universal 'problem' to which human beings respond to with a variety of solutions. For Geertz, it is 'through the circumstantial understanding of these unique solutions ... that the nature of the underlying problems to which they are a comparable response can be truly comprehended' (1972: 363).

The responses that Brazilians give to the time 'gained' in Ireland can be explored in relation to the notion of opportunity-cost and the subsequent judgements and assessments that migrants make of their fellow migrants and of their own time spent in Ireland. To do this, I largely rely on Alfred Gell's definition of time-anthropology which consists in 'the development of means of representing, dispassionately and critically, the manifold ways in which time becomes salient in human affairs' (1992: 315). Borrowing from Taggart, Gell (1992) makes an important distinction between time -- past, present and future, and the processes that happen in time -- before and after, which is helpful to the present discussion. Gell further argues that the foundations of time-anthropology should lie in what can be objectively understood, knowing however that 'there is no contradiction between allowing that time can be studied in many different cultural and ethnographic contexts, and can be understood with the aid of many different analytical frameworks, while simultaneously maintaining that time is always one and the same, a familiar dimensional property of our experienced surroundings' (Gell 1992: 315). These two components of analysis are important since

the evaluation of migrants' experiences in Ireland reflect not only the moment-to-moment of past, present and future but reflects an evaluation of what could have been possible and what, in fact, is the reality. For example, when a migrant says that life in Brazil will be good for those who used their time in Ireland wisely, the comment suggests that the migrant was able to maximize the potentialities that emigrating to Ireland offered.

Chatting whilst sipping our Brazilian coffee, Lucas reflects that for him and others who have his same ambition and determination, life in Ireland is lived with the future in mind. He rarely forgets about it and this is one of the elements that distinguishes him from other Brazilian migrants who 'have not been able to save'. Other migrants, Lucas suggests, have become accustomed to a lifestyle of spending, which he has avoided, and for this reason they have lost focus of their initial goal that brought them to Ireland in the first instance. Lucas illustrates:

There are people who have been there [Ireland] for over 10 years, from here, from Epitácio, and they are there until this day because ... they don't have the means to return, not even to pay for their return ticket, because ... I'm sure you know, in Ireland ... you have a good life [financially] in relation to Brazil, right? But in the same way that you earn well you also spend a lot, the cost of living is very high, so you need to consider these two things, isn't it? So if you go there and you spend like you spend here, there is no point ... [so, you need to tight the belt] exactly, because in Brazil you might have some financial difficulties, but how can I tell you this? In Brazil you live, right? There you don't live, well it's not that you don't live, really you don't have time to live the kind of life you live here. There you work, isn't it? ... But if you know how to save you'll do well ... but you need to leave Brazil with that in mind. (Interview, July 2011)

Since time is understood here as relational, it harbours a certain 'timeless truth', as Gell (1992) suggests, through which present actions are projected and seem to predict future enterprises, that is, someone did well because they knew how to save and were wise, characteristics which are understood as fixed and nearly intrinsic to the person. In that sense, the time spent in Ireland is used as a measure through which migrants judge their achievements and the achievements of other migrants not only in the present but it

serves as an indictment to other opportunities still to happen in the future; it serves as a prediction outcome of future opportunities. For example, the assumption is that someone who did not do well in Ireland will not do well in Brazil, precisely because the perceived result of what happened in a particular timeframe serves as 'timeless truth'. Furthermore, a migrant who emigrated but was not 'wise to save' has lost not only an opportunity to progress financially at that particular moment in time but also 'incurs the opportunity cost attendant on the non-realization of this alternative possible world' (Gell 1992: 215) which is projected into the future.

Gell argues that unlike money, time is not a resource and therefore it cannot be stored or kept in a time-bank until the opportunity arises to use it. But when migrants remark that only those who were wise with their time in Ireland were able to save money, it reveals a conception of time where every possible event is lived, understood and ordered in relation to other possible events. If on the one hand the use of time in Ireland has a certain 'timeless truth' and says something about the individual, on the other hand there is something quite extraordinary about it since it is a punctual moment in time, and for many it is felt as a moment of discontinuity or rather as a 'diversion' to what their lives would have been, had they stayed in Brazil. This life is, for many, to be returned to after they have passed the 'diversion' which, of course, is not always the case. The point I would like to make is that the impact of these punctual moments and their potentialities can, and are, measured and evaluated by migrants themselves, and affect migrants differently depending on the particular interval of time they arrived in Ireland. In the light of this, migration is an element which introduces itself into social life. For this reason, its impact can be measured by migrants themselves precisely because it is external to their social world in Brazil. Having said that, I feel that what is really being measured is not time itself but money which serves as the yardstick through

which time is to be measured. Time is not a resource, and here I am in agreement with Gell, but can, as he argues, be treated like one in order to discuss opportunity-costs.

For Lucas, Ireland represents a landmark in his life largely because he knew how to use that time. In the following quote he clearly outlines the relationship between opportunity and costs:

There's no point in leaving Presidente Epitácio and coming back with no guarantees or without [financial] stability because in that case, why did I go there [Ireland] for? Because if you go there and come back with no guarantees, it means that you went there ... you didn't buy anything and you wasted your time which is something that is worth more because you don't get it back. It's different with money, if you lose money you might be able to earn more later ... but if you lose time ... it doesn't come back. (Interview, July 2011)

Whereas Lucas lives for the future in Brazil, some of his friends live for the present in Ireland:

I have friends who want to live in Ireland, they like it here really, I like it here but it's not my lifestyle, my lifestyle is completely different ... like, going out, I don't find it is interesting going to pubs and shopping all the time. In Brazil, there are simple things, you go to the river - it's very hot, you go to a bar and play a game of pool with your friends, you invite your friends for a barbecue at home, you go to your relatives' houses to a barbecue, simple things that you don't really have here. (Interview, December 2010)

Patterns of consumption of time between Brazil and Ireland are seen in nearly direct opposition, and in Ireland, migrants come into contact with more 'efficient forms of consumption' (see Gell 1992). In Brazil one of the reasons that make 'simple things' simple, is the fact that they do not involve considerable spending as is the case of life in Ireland; they do involve however a bigger investment in time, hence a more 'inefficient form of consumption'. But, as Gell suggests, it is not objective facts that make time surplus or deficient since 'time surplus/shortage is a function of perceived opportunity costs, not of objective quantitative relationships between 'real' resources' (1992: 212). Much along the same line of thought as Lucas, Luis and Vitoria note that their financial achievements in Ireland were only possible through hard-work and a persistent focus on

their aims in Brazil. For this reason they did not socialise outside the house, as they illustrate here:

Drinking in pubs was very expensive ... so we didn't go out much ... we both like beer ... but we drank at home, we would buy it in the supermarket and drink at home ... sometimes it was a little embarrassing because a friend would say "do you want to come to the pub?", and we'd come up with an excuse, they would say "do you want to go out for dinner" ... and I'd say "I've already eaten", I think I had dinner out twice in all those years in Ireland. (Interview, July 2011)

Luis and Vitoria on the other hand used their time in Ireland to save and invest, as they clarify, in 'good things':

We bought good things but it was fruit of our work and our dedication, today I'd go back to Ireland but I'd go with a different way of thinking, I'd go to Ireland to enjoy what I didn't enjoy when I was there, we wouldn't be worrying about money to buy anything, the money we'd make there, we'd spend there, we'd study [English] ... we didn't pay for a school [whilst in Ireland] because we thought that €20 for a two-hour class was too much ... and nowadays I wouldn't be worrying about that. (Interview, July 2011)

In the light of this, it is fair to assume that the proposition put forward earlier that one year in Ireland equates to seven years in Brazil would stop making sense, because earning money would not be a priority anymore, the priority would now be enjoyment, and therefore it would make no sense measuring time based on the potential amount of money that could be earned in Ireland.

Contrary to common wisdom, movement in space is not always time consuming, in fact migrants evaluate their time as 'wasting time' or 'gaining time'. Time is always time-consuming only if we think about it in a linear and sequential form moving from past to present to future, but not if we consider the gains and losses in relation to before and after. My point is that, when Brazilian migrants refer to time spent in Ireland, they speak of something that can be appropriated to create something which should not exist, that is, excess of time transformed into money, hence the notion of 'economy of time' discussed earlier. What is also relevant here, and which will be discussed later, is how

that time gained in Ireland becomes as source of power and influence in Brazil and the impact that that has on reintegration upon return.

Through the experience of a certain kind of modernity in Ireland time is recognised as a resource, something which can be transformed into an opportunity with very specific costs associated to it. Access to money and other economic determinants seem to be invoked in policy statements as the ‘explain all’ of migratory flows. As seen earlier, migrants are often considered to be persons in need, making rational decisions to address their economic circumstances and progress economically. Although there is an argument here about time-economy, this analysis of opportunity-cost does not contradict the argument put forward earlier that migrants do not simply make rational decisions when considering emigrating, since the recognition of time as a resource is only retrospectively done, and it is this relationship between time and money which ultimately influences the migrant’s cognition of time.

The use of time, Gell (1992) asserts, is never an act of free choice but is rather a choice made within a set of constraints. What follows inquires into some of these constraints. Whilst there is certainly an element of economic considerations which cannot be denied, I would like to suggest that an examination of phenomena commonly considered to be secondary deserve new and detailed attention, and will shed light on the kinds of decisions that migrants face when considering their return to Brazil. If return is to be understood and comprehensively addressed in policy, it must get away from explanations cemented on purely rational choices, and it needs to complicate the analysis of migratory flows beyond the rigidity and the ‘consensus’, as Gilles Deleuze (1997) suggests, imposed by policy and regulations dictated at national and international level. It must also account for the emotional processes and temporal meanings through which migrants make decisions and consider alternatives to their circumstances.

In Ireland, Brazilian migrants have graduated rights, the degree of which is largely dependent on the timeframe of their arrival in the country. Within particular timeframes the effects of the gradation of such rights is not homogenous and is greatly determined by the migrant's acceptance or refusal of the regulations pressed on them, and on the strategies found to circumvent the limits imposed on their social and economic world. In these circumstances, migrants contemplate the creation of change or obeying old habits. One of such strategies of change, and of 'gaining' time in Ireland, is marriage of convenience which grants migrant's access to live and work in Ireland, as well as, possible access to Irish citizenship. The discussion that follows is not meant to be about marriage or citizenship as such, but it offers a route of enquire about the consumption of citizenship through marriage, and will provide a platform to discuss the levels of consumption that migrants encounter in Ireland and which come to shape their lives in Ireland and upon return to Brazil. Consumption of citizenship is used here as an initial example to illustrate the means through which the artificial becomes real, the priceless becomes priceable, and the emotional triggers a number of rational options which materialise in concrete actions. As such, the following examines those secondary phenomena which are usually left out of policy regulations but which come to shape migrants' lives in Ireland and in Brazil.

Slavoj Žižek (2000) argues that what holds a particular sense of nation together is the identification that its members associate with a specific form of enjoyment, a particular 'Thing' which quite often defies definition, and the many ways the community organises it. It also involves a common understanding of what this form of enjoyment presupposes, and a belief that the other members of the community truly believe in that same 'national Thing', that is, the nation is experienced *qua* Thing. Hence, as Žižek observes, members of a community 'who partake in a given "way of life" believe in their Thing, where this belief has a reflexive structure proper to the

intersubjective space: “I believe in the (national) Things” equals “I believe that others (members of my community) believe in the Thing” (2000: 595), that is, in order to be able to enjoy and fully be a part of that something, one must believe in it and believe that others believe as much as we do. The question of belief is relevant here because if migrants are unable to, or unwilling to believe in this ‘Thing’, then they are different, and if they are different they do not fit in. Žižek continues by arguing that the common idea of a national cause, of that thing that binds us together, is ‘nothing but the way subjects of a given ethnic community organize their enjoyment through national myths’ (2000: 596), and in so doing, what is bothering about outsiders is their ability to organise their enjoyment differently and the enjoyment they are able to extract from their own peculiar way of enjoying something. The paradox is that, as Žižek observes, at the same time that ‘our’ enjoyment is ‘conceived as something inaccessible to the other’ (2000: 596) it is also threatened by the enjoyment that the other extracts from his own enjoyment. The relevance of this idea for the present case is that ‘enjoyment is good, on condition that it not be too close to us, on condition that it remains the other’s enjoyment’ (2000: 599). But the other’s enjoyment requires a degree of self-sufficiency and freewill which is often a disturbing condition to national-states.

The case of marriages of convenience are of importance for states and the European Union as they are seen as a way to circumvent the rules imposed by Member States, they are representative of the other’s capacity for self-sufficiency and autonomy, which threatens the stability, integrity and sovereignty of national territories. In such cases, measures are adopted to ensure that migrants remain within the limitations of their graduated rights. For example, the Council of the European Union adopted the Council Resolution 97/C 382/01 which problematises ‘marriages of convenience’, and refers to them as a phenomenon which needs to be combated⁷. The problematisation of marriages of convenience are illustrative of the attempts made by national states in

⁷ See http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/other/133063_en.htm

restricting the movement of people, their autonomy and ability to find solutions to their own issues, by seeking support in tradition as the ‘true’ reasons that should be behind marriage. This attitude seems to go against the very key elements of neoliberal reasoning based on economic efficiency and self-responsibility (see Ong 2006). What is interesting here is that whilst modernity largely involves sweeping tradition under the carpet, it is tradition itself which sustains concepts of modern nation-states (see Žižek 2000). The course of action taken by nation-states is met by an important obstacle which is the fact that individuals and, here in particular, Brazilian migrants at the bottom of the rights ladder generate actions to respond to such policies. Contrary to conventional wisdom, these responses are not purely rational as ‘a way to remain in Ireland’ but arise out of deep anxiety about the migrant’s place in the world, and nearly always as a means of salvation that enables them to remain in a place they consider modern, and which epitomises freedom and equality.

When Isabelle came to Ireland during the period described earlier as the third wave of Brazilian migration, Ireland had already closed the doors, albeit with some exceptions, to non-EU migrants. Isabelle, like Alice and many others, entered Ireland on a tourist visa which she subsequently overstayed. For years she worked in the informal economy as a domestic cleaner which was not of much concern to her mainly because she was surrounded by family and friends, and never felt in danger. However, two events prompted her to reconsider her circumstances: firstly was the fact that she wanted to return to Brazil to visit her mother whom she had not seen since coming to Ireland. As a migrant who had previously overstayed her entry authorisation, being granted leave-to-enter Ireland after her return from Brazil was highly unlikely; and secondly the rumour circulated that some Brazilians were reporting other Brazilians with an irregular status to the local authorities and that such authorities were going from house to house arresting people and issuing deportation orders. The veracity of such

stories was never fully disclosed, although Alice reported moving out for this reason, but there was a sense of uneasiness about the possibility that such could happen. Isabelle was anxious about this, and a friend suggested that one possibility to resolve the situation would be to marry someone with a residency permit or with Irish citizenship; in other words, a marriage of convenience.

Initially, Isabelle was asked for €1,800 by the other party to marry her, but she could not afford to pay that amount. In absolute terms, Isabelle felt that €1,800 was not an unreasonable amount of money to ask for in exchange for a marriage certificate and hence, a legal authorisation to reside in Ireland. In fact, she even thought it was 'fair', as she explains:

Nowadays no one does anything for free ... I even said to him, "Look if I had the money I would pay because it's fair, it's your name, your visa, you know? ... But I don't have that kind of money" ... after that he didn't contact me again and I didn't contact him. (Interview, April 2011)

Isabelle ended up marrying someone else; there was no exchange of money as a friend married her 'out of goodness'. The civil wedding took place in the Registry Office and although both families knew about the wedding, only 4 people, including the bride and groom, were present; as the groom put it himself, 'it's a contract, not a wedding'. About the day, Isabelle recalls:

We went in, we got married, and we left. There was no wedding party, of course, because we wouldn't really go that far ... it's a façade marriage, and then it was over. ... I bought a wedding ring, costume jewellery, because it was not a wedding, so much so that none of us uses it ... there was no kiss. (Interview, April 2011)

Isabelle was adamant that the wedding would be a quick and unromantic affair, a 'private arrangement', as she put it, without guests, a formality and a union sealed with costume jewellery. Ultimately, this portrait of a wedding is the exact opposite of what a wedding should be in Isabelle's eyes, and something which she strongly suggested she would have never done if she was living in Brazil. So the question is why? Why was a

marriage of convenience an unthinkable possibility in Brazil, and was a viable option in Ireland? The immediate answer points to the fact that a clear problem was identified by Isabelle and a subsequent logical and rational response was articulated to address that specific problem. Her situation of irregularity in Ireland led her to consider reasonable options to address the problem. It was an issue which she had postponed since arriving in Ireland and which she was only considering now. However the consideration of the issue was not one which arose out of rational thought.

George E. Marcus (2002) argues that emotion and rational thought are not mutually exclusive. In fact, only through emotion can change take place, and Marcus alerts us for the damages and dangers of endorsing obligations as a 'cerebral reflection on justice and the common good' (2002: 135). His central argument is that citizens are able to be rational and deliberate precisely because they are emotional, and are able to take action because of the unity of such processes. He further argues that emotion systems enable reason, and suggests that individuals are equipped with surveillance systems which rely on emotional markers which are triggered by threats or new situations that the brain is not familiar with. By becoming aware of new circumstances, the person experiences anxiety. When circumstances place us in what we perceive as an unfamiliar or unsafe environment, the surveillance systems react by setting aside habitual forms of responding to situations and by leading us to consider other alternatives, 'this ability provides the basis for an important issue of choice ... these emotion systems provide us with the capacity to execute either of two conditional strategies: reliance on habit or reliance on reasoned consideration' (Marcus 2002: 76).

Regardless of which strategies we choose to adopt, they both have emotional foundations. Exercising choice, rather than relying on the repetition of habits, becomes a survival mechanism to ensure that we remain capable of managing our lives. Thus, Marcus (2002: 86) notes that the consideration of choices and options are tied to a

particular time and a particular place. This explains why Isabelle would consider the option of a marriage of convenience whereas in Brazil this is a hypothesis which she would not even contemplate. Up until the moment when her circumstances changed, Isabelle remained in Ireland without considering the possibility of a marriage of convenience. However, when her sense of safety was disturbed she was no longer in the realm of the familiar and she consciously decided that she needed to consider other alternatives. Once the balance was disturbed, an emotional response was triggered and levels of anxiety needed to be managed. As Marcus observes, ‘the surveillance system and its principal sensation, anxiety, by engaging the conscious mind, explains when and why people are likely to set aside their habits and think up new possibilities to approach the situation afresh’ (2002: 97).

Although a state of anxiety, unfamiliarity, and lack of safety does not lead by itself into a particular action, ‘it does change the way people go about deciding’ and paths the way for the consideration of alternatives outside of the familiar and comfortable (Marcus 2002: 105). The consideration of alternatives is also important because it represents the moment in time when the migrant is confronted with the prospect of continuity or change. It is the anxiety created by certain immigration policies that is the central emotion which ‘recruits reason and disables habit’ and ‘provides the requisite oversight to make sense of the world’ (Marcus 2002: 116).

Although migration policies set rules and regulations which are meant to be followed and not circumvented, the bottom line is that migrants are faced with moments when reliance on their old understandings of ‘marriage’ or ‘citizenship’ does not serve them well. In the light of this, they juggle the two possibilities of either continuing with their old understandings or creating change. However, punitive and restrictive migration policies are often cemented on reason and reason alone. Without the guidance of emotional processes, by understanding why people react the way that they do, such

resolutions are often difficult to implement. For these reasons, Marcus suggests that ‘the practice of citizenship must acknowledge the role of emotion plays in the development of rationality: if emotionality enables rationality, then the effort to exclude passion will also undermine our capacity to reason’ (Marcus 2002: 7). In short, migrants do not, in my experience, set out to contravene the rules but when confronted with certain realities, alternatives are considered which causes them to complete an action which they would have never contemplated before, that is, a marriage of convenience. This shows that despite the attempts made by nation-states to control their borders, migrants find alternatives, and it should be recognised and considered that these agendas, as Rachel Adler (2000) notes, are not purely economic in nature.

Whilst the above may explain the reasons for the consideration of alternatives to Isabelle’s situation, it does not necessarily address Isabelle’s suggestion that €1,800 was a fair amount to pay for a marriage certificate and possible access to Irish citizenship. So the question remains, at what point do migrants come to think about citizenship as something that can be bought and sold? Or rather, why and at what point does citizenship become a commodity, with a money-value that can be judged as fair or unfair?

Brazilian migrants associate passion with happiness and warmth, with the ability to interact with others, to forge and maintain relationships based on solidarity and generosity. This is a relationship only possible in Brazil which stands in opposition to the image associated with Ireland, that is, Ireland and the Irish as cold and distant but whose lives are regulated by reason. Similar comments are made other Brazilian migrants; for example Brazilians in London speak of their hosts as being ‘stiff and hierarchical’ (Torresan 1994); Martes (2000) observes that Brazilians in the United States found Americans distant and money-oriented, and Brazilians in Portugal contrasted their spontaneity and exuberance with the formal demeanor of the Portuguese

‘presupposing grace, self-control, and ultimately civility’ (Torresan 2011: 241); the Japanese Brazilians that Tsuda conducted research with found the Japanese to be ‘cold’, ‘closed’ and lacking human warmth (2003: 181).

Beyond these perceptions however, the time spent in Ireland enables migrants to interact with a world that they define as the ‘First World’ where justice, order, equality and economic freedom is possible (see also Margolis 1994; Martes 2000; Tsuda 2003). Moreover, and similar to the experience of Brazilians in the United States (Martes 2000), Brazilians in Ireland do not feel they are treated in a diminishing manner by Irish people, in some cases, and especially in the case of women working as cleaners, they even feel that they are more respected than if they were doing the same job in Brazil (cf. Tsuda 2003). References to the politeness of Irish people, to the tidiness and cleanness of public spaces, to the accountability in the political sphere and the lack of corruption, all stand in contrast to their imagine of Brazil. In a comparative reflection between Ireland and Brazil, Vitoria is torn between the two countries:

Today, I don’t know, I think that if someone asked me “do you want to go back to Ireland”, I think I, I want to, and bear in mind that I’m studying, I’m working, but I’m not yet, like, I’m totally lost, I don’t know, do you understand? I don’t know, Brazil is a very good country to live in, but like, I’m Brazilian, I love Brazil, my country, but like, we find yourselves in situations, there are moments when you feel disappointed. (Interview, July 2011)

And Luis picks up on her reflections:

We’re disappointed because we had the opportunity to know other culture, right? And when you’ve seen a different culture where everything works, where the law works, where the government works, then you come back and you start looking at your own country ... and it’s disappointing when we think that we’ve lived in a country where everything works, right? That everything was different, right? And ... we think “wouldn’t Ireland be better for the future of our children? They would have better schooling, better training”, and people there are very polite ... and the Brazilian is a little rough ... and we didn’t want our children to become like that, since they’ve already lived a better life ... so we question ourselves and wonder if this is worthwhile, we’ve built an estate ... we’ve got all those things, but we wonder “is this everything? Is this all? Is this what is important?” ... and we see this is as a complement but it’s not life, I don’t worry about money anymore ... there are other more important things, there are values that are more important than money. (Interview, July 2011)

When Alice forgets about her own difficulties in Ireland, her eyes light up and she is able to see the silver lining in the dark cloud that was Ireland in her personal experience:

You know, that's the kind of thing that stays with you, it's a very good country ... the people are very polite, something I found strange ... they say 'sorry' if they touch you ever so slightly on the street, ... it's a very different culture from the Brazilian, they are very polite, very honest ... so I liked that a lot because here in Brazil people are always in a hurry, they don't respect pedestrians ... another thing that marked me [in Ireland] was that people go out at night and they get a taxi [home] because they know that there justice works, there the law is quick ... here people go out and take their car, get drunk and they don't care, there you don't do this, even the Brazilians themselves learn these things ... so these are the things you bring with you ... and I liked that ... you get used to certain things there and then you stop to think ... you start reflecting because you see other people doing the right thing. (Interview, June 2011)

Notwithstanding, Alice points out that continuing to 'do the right thing' in Brazil sets her apart from other people, small gestures like saying 'excuse me' are received by intrigued faces. And, because of the clothes, shoes, accessories and imported perfume which she brought from Ireland she also looks visibly different. Especially in the first few months these behaviours, memories and habits acquired in Ireland remain fresh as do the memories of being able to afford clothes and other items which in Brazil are expensive and inaccessible to her.

Ireland represents a world without social contradictions, a world 'where everything works'. Ireland is experienced as the modernity project, the modern state where economic and administrative rationalisation, individual freedom and order, open the doors to a new social world (see Ritzer 1996; Simmel 2011; Featherstone 1991; Harvey 2004). This is, of course, a world vision where reason is privileged over emotion and passions. It is a close approximation to a Weberian model of state sovereignty cemented on the rationalisation of the political system, the legitimacy of a rational-legal system enacted by laws and regulations which authorities are able to

reinforce, and a good deal of faith in political leaders to gradually change society into a better place (see Ritzer 1996).

This vision of an equal, ordered Irish society and corruption-free Irish political system is however not always shared with Irish people themselves. Fintan O'Toole (2010) demystifies modern understandings of Ireland and shows his disillusionment with democracy. In fact, he goes as far as to say that many Irish people would be well aware that they live in a 'democracy where influence and power could be bought' (O'Toole 2010: 31). The pervasive perception in Irish life that it is not important what one knows but rather who one knows, stands in sharp contrast to the vision that Brazilian migrants have of Irish society. Rather, the myth of Irish modernity merges the elements of modernity and progress with clear incorporations of romanticised elements of Irish tradition (see Gibbons 1988). Here Brazilian migrants encounter the 'fiction of cultural homogeneity' (Comaroff and Comaroff 2012: 95). In the absence of knowledge and awareness of the historical complexities migrants rely on a vision of Ireland as cosmopolitan but culturally homogenous. At the same time, this vision is clearly being disputed in public and academic discourses where a new image is being brought to light showing that the ongoing modernisation of Irish identity and the neo-traditionalist vision left behind history itself and some segments of the Irish population alike whose identity did not fit with the modern project (see Gibbons 1988; Fanning 2002; Fanning 2009; Lentin 2007). A case in point is the outcome of the citizenship referendum held in 2004 which culminated with an overwhelming majority of Irish citizens voting in favour of the amendment to the Constitution of Ireland and the removal of unrestricted birthrights based on *jus soli* and the introduction of *jus sanguinis* citizenship based on descent. The debate leading up to the referendum was shaped by anti-asylum seeker sentiments and claims by politicians and different strands of society against the so-called 'baby tourism' (see Crowley et al 2006; Fanning et al 2007; Harrington 2005;

Mullaly 2007; Lentin 2007). As Žižek argues, ‘tolerance is tolerance for the Other in so far as this Other is not an ‘intolerant fundamentalist’ - which simply means in so far as it is not the real Other’ (2004: 61). Whilst liberal tolerance can be applied to ‘us’ as post-modern individuals capable of making our own decisions, when it comes to including the ‘Other’ or their ideas and actions -- such as in cases of marriage of convenience, the measure applied is tradition and not individual free choice.

Regardless of migrants’ experience of Irish life being aligned with the experiences of modernity that Irish scholars critically discuss, the point is that migrants desire much of what they have experienced as modern in Ireland, and construct lives where alternative modernities are tailored to their own historical and social worlds, and where modes of survival and ‘enjoyment’ are being fashioned. Migrants have often referred to Ireland as a place where money is easy. Lucas said at one point ‘you know, now there is a [economic] crisis in Ireland but I always wondered where all that money came from’ (Interview, July 2011). In the everyday in Ireland, the act of consumption is experienced not as a fruit of labour, but rather it is experienced as a miracle (see Baudrillard 1998). Ireland is a place where ‘everything is easy [whereas] in Brazil nothing is easy’. It was not uncommon to hear, ‘In Ireland life is the same for everyone’, a place where, in migrants’ views, ‘everyone is the same, everyone buys clothes, everyone has a car’. As discussed in chapter 2, in Ireland, Brazilian migrants come to experience the expanding properties of money proper which enables them to access the ‘economy of time’ and save in one year what would otherwise take them seven. On the other hand, the new availability of money shows regressive properties that widen the gap between migrants and the social life they knew. Furthermore, the availability of money creates new possibilities of being in the world, new forms of consumption, which require a rethinking of the relationship that individuals have with

money and time, as well as with concepts which they took as absolute before, such as the concept of ‘marriage’.

Fintan O’Toole notes that during the economic boom Irish people experienced not just a new economic ideology, but the Celtic Tiger years were also ‘a substitute identity. ... At its cheapest, this identity expressed itself in a mad consumerism ... But there were other things wrapped up in it too - optimism, confidence, a new openness and ease, and absence of fear’ (2010: 3). This reflection is not too dissimilar from much of the sentiments that migrants have about those same years. In Ireland, migrants came to know a place where all could be bought and sold, where money seemed to be unlimited. By the same analogous formula, in much the same way that ‘the boom did liberate the Irish from the sense of history’ (O’Toole 2010: 5) and economic collapse and political corruption of the 1980s, migration liberated Brazilian migrants from the hardships of the past and projected a new future of hopefulness and economic prosperity. In this process, migrants experience a world not too dissimilar to O’Toole’s Irish democracy, where power and influence can be bought, and a political culture where politics and the market are deeply intertwined. Remember the well documented case of the Masri family and the alleged ‘passports for sale’ involving the then Taoiseach the late Albert Reynolds and his family company C&D Foods (see Finlay 2007).

If citizenship is a product of the nation-state, then it is reasonable to assume that it is deeply embedded in economic exchange. David Graeber (2012) goes as far as to argue that state and market are one and the same thing, and neither one could have existed without the other. So, the question remains as to why we are so deeply shocked when citizenship is given a price? And, by the same token, when is that price fair? By understanding the need to buy or to marry someone with Irish citizenship or with a residence and work permit, and by surprisingly agreeing and rationalising this

transaction, migrants are at a more advanced stage than politicians and social policy as they have a clear understanding of their place in the world, both as migrants and as human beings, inserted in a complex network of societal institutions which facilitate the exchange of commodities. Mike Featherstone (1991) notes that consideration must be given to the ways through which goods move in and out of commodity status, and the length of time they avail of that status as they move from production to consumption. Migrants have understood that in the world they live in, citizenship has become a commodity, a good which can be consumed, bought and sold, and enjoyed; a good with exchange-value and which can be negotiated and used to access rights, wealth and, perhaps more importantly, 'peace of mind'. Migration policy remains linked to the concept that citizenship is tied to a national territory, and is an honour bestowed on the migrant by the host nation as recently suggested at a citizenship ceremony speech.⁸ As such, migrants are treated as populations 'in transit', as 'uprooted' people (see Malkki 1992) in need of a place to call 'home'; however, migrants are 're-rooting' themselves not in citizenship as such but in the new modes of consumption which are not exclusive to one or the other national territory. And it is perhaps, the ability to become part and to belong to different nation-states through the exercise of consumption modes that represents the real threat in a political context, since national loyalties are mediated by complex networks of social and moral institutions which are being facilitated by the exchange of commodities. Abdelmalek Sayad observes that 'countries of immigration enjoy the 'privilege' of being able to control, quantify and enumerate how many of the other country's emigrants are present' (1999: 121), but it seems to me that this 'privilege' is partly illusory to the extent that migrants find ways to circumvent the law and regulations, not necessarily because they set out to but because they function as strategies of survival.

⁸ See <http://www.merriestreet.ie/index.php/2014/03/speech-by-alan-shatter-at-the-citizenship-ceremony-city-hall-waterford-7-march-2014/>

Graeber (2012) had already observed that the state and the market were inseparable and that, in the absence of coercive totalitarian states, market relations tend to be integrated in a web of social relations, a 'moral economy' regulated by traditional values. But these traditional values are likely to change and be rearranged to respond to market forces and global capitalism. Citizenship elements for example, and considerations of entitlement to live and work in national territories, are increasingly being associated with neoliberal agendas, and different populations are being graded depending on their contributions to the national territory and the potential contributions to the European Member States, hence the preoccupation with marriages of convenience across the European borders. Nation-states are generating spaces of 'graduated citizenship' (Ong 2006) which are suggestive of new ways of governing diverse populations within the national territory and which respond to forms of valuation of such populations. Moreover, 'graduated citizenship' is deeply tied to the market potential of new populations and their capacity to create value. Such state practices discourage attention from the fates assigned to the populations which fall outside positive economic outcomes.

Aihwa Ong (2006) argues that rather than taking neoliberal reasoning as an all-encompassing concept which tends to divide the world in two, between centres of power and capital run by neoliberal states and the rest of the world, it would be a more fruitful analysis to consider the various technologies behind the exercise of neoliberal policies which permit the management of national territories as a heterogeneous political and economic space. By doing so, we can start to unmask other forms of power and exclusion which are not tied to national territories but which flourish within them. Ong coins the term 'graduated sovereignty' to describe 'the effects of a flexible management of sovereignty, as governments adjust political space to the dictates of global capital' (2006: 78). 'Graduated sovereignty' which Ong describes is however, in

my view, not only spatial but it is also temporal as is clearly evident in the mixed bag of rights and entitlements available to Brazilian migrants depending on the date of their arrival in Ireland. However, as Ong suggests, these are 'political exceptions that permit sovereign practices and subjectifying techniques that deviate from the established norm' (2006: 12), and the governance of diverse populations across space and time. The state becomes less the administrator of borders and more the regulator of populations within the nation-state, making 'explicit calculations' about the value of human contributions to the national economy. Migrants are encompassed in these calculations via immigration and integration policies, and are integrated in the national landscape through the acquisition of graduated rights and 'graduated citizenship' which enable them to work and reside in the receiving country. 'Graduated citizenship' (Ong 2006) is not necessarily attached to formal modes of citizenship but refers to forms of governing different populations which are considered 'in transit' and which are excluded from a pool of entitlements and rights because their contributions to the receiving society are judged as less valuable than other populations. It is unlikely that migration policies, rules and regulations, which rely on rational and economic thought alone can comprehensively and effectively address the many complexities of migration processes. If migrants' contributions to the receiving society are judged as being valuable or invaluable, and rights and entitlements are granted to them on the basis of such calculations, then it is reasonable to assume that migrants are capable of performing the same calculations when confronted with unfamiliar situations.

Nation-states are being confronted with such decisions taking place within the confines of national territories, and with the rise of what Jean and John Comaroff (2012: 24) term 'policulturalism'. The term refers to the 'politicization of diversity' which expresses the demands for recognition that different populations make of the state, populations which are likely to possess multiple identities, and are subject to growing

inequalities. The emergence of alternative modernities across national spaces, suggest that concepts such as citizenship are becoming disarticulated from national territories and are becoming ever more connected with market forces (see Comaroff and Comaroff 2012; Ong 2006). National spaces are being adjusted to accommodate new citizens and corporations able to respond to the demands of global capitalism, and nation-states are creating zones of ‘graduated sovereignty’ to respond to such demands (Ong 2006).

If migrants are viewed and judged as desirable or undesirable based on economic determinations, and their contributions are being rationalised and valued based on efficiency, the migrant is through this logic established as a business variable, a ‘copyrighted collective possession’, a Migrant Inc. (Comaroff and Comaroff 2012: 77). In this context, through their deliberations and choices -- in Isabelle’s case through a marriage of convenience, migrants are already finding spaces to silently voice their concerns and engage in participatory politics. For these reasons, it must be acknowledged that individuals are resourceful, and when constructed as excludable populations they are capable of defining strategies to reclaim their rights as universal citizens through alternative forms that will enable them to access rights and entitlements. Whilst alternative forms of modernity tend to privilege experiences within and across national borders, I would like to suggest that there is also a need to consider temporal experiences of modernity. It is true that the acquisition of citizenship for migrants permit travel across space but these rights are acquired and accessed within time ‘exceptions’, to use Ong’s term, which allow access to international markets.

The Irish government decided not to impose restrictions on labour market access for the EU joining States on 1 May 2004. Since the accession of the EU10, emphasis has been placed on the significant inward migration from the EU. However, at the same time that Ireland opened its borders to the citizens of the EU new Member States, it made it more restrictive for non-EU/EEA workers to pursue employment in Ireland.

Brazilian migrants arriving during the first and the second wave of migration are considerably better positioned to access rights and benefits not because they are seen as more or less talented than those arriving during the third wave, but rather because they were better placed to respond to economic imperatives, and were in Ireland at a time when the country experienced labour shortages. On the other hand, those who arrived from 2003 onwards are positioned in the limits of citizenship and subject to exclusionary practices. These time 'exceptions' create graduated citizens who, on the other hand, live by their own 'economy of time', creating their own valuations of the advances and regressions of the time spent abroad, and the investments made during that period. Thus time becomes something to be used, multiplied and maximised through migration, wasted, a product as observed by Baudrillard (1998) of our culture and economic system, that is, a commodity exchangeable by money.

In Ireland, Brazilian migrants may have come into contact with a new version of the modern project and of neoliberalism different from their experiences in Brazil. But above all, they came into contact with the tools to respond to the claims of the market, to respond to the call of the consumer society through the wider availability of money, the enchantment of window shopping in large shopping centres, the playfulness of McDonald's, the status of drinking Coca-Cola, the prosperity of a full shopping trolley full of unessential items, and the sense of equality derived from living in a housing estate where all houses look the same. In Ireland they come to experience a lifestyle that 'affirm the neoliberal message of freedom and self-realizations through consumption' (Comaroff and Comaroff 2012:159). Migrants have often referred to Ireland as a place where money is easy, but as argued above, goods, such as 'citizenship', move in and out of commodity status through forms that are not exclusively dependent on an increased access to money. Through consumption, the consumer demands more than just goods and services, and accesses freedom, aspiration, and choice (see Baudrillard 1998).

Hence, it is the consumer experience that leads to individual freedom and not the quantity of money in itself. Therefore, paying €1.800 for a marriage of convenience, that is, for the prospect of living and working in Ireland as well as the potential access to Irish citizenship, is not a high price to pay. It is the possibilities that money affords and the experiences that it enables that is experienced as freedom, as choice, as happiness. Thus, the question of consumption must account for all those other forms, and for the postmodern elements that tell us that through consumption we will be happy, we must be happy.

Modern life is characterized by anxiety about a variety of insufficiencies (see Ritzer 1998), and for Brazilian migrants this anxiety is reflected on their decision to postpone their return to Brazil. The decision to remain in Ireland is reasoned as the answer to addressing the insufficiencies and uncertainties that a life in Brazil will bring upon return. However, what is now perceived as insufficient is a direct result of those experiences of 'what is modern' in Ireland. Similar to sites of cultural disorder (Baudrillard 1998; Featherstone 1991) which become sources of fascination, time spent in Ireland provides routes of access to spaces of enchantment, sites where cultural and social boundaries become blurred. Baudrillard suggests that at the heart of consumption is a totalizing system organising everyday life, 'where everything is taken over and superseded in the ease and translucidity of an abstract 'happiness', defined solely by the resolution of tensions' (1998: 30).

The everyday becomes the locus of consumption, far from the systematic organisation of consumption experienced pre-migration, when payments, repayments, and new debts were contracted at the beginning of the month. Consumption in Ireland exists as a continuous event, which some migrants diagnose as a 'compulsion'. Alice laughed at the amount of boots that her sister brought with her when she returned to Brazil, 'can you believe? 30 pairs of boots! Who wears boots in the kind of weather we

have here?’ In the end, as suggested by Marcuse (2002 [1964]) all reason becomes submissive to the facts of life and consumption, and people start recognising themselves in their commodities. Consumption appears as an unquenchable call, not clearly divided into essential and non-essential items anymore (Featherstone 1991), and goods move across these two categories. If we recall from chapter 2, Alice noted, ‘In Brazil, when your shoes are worn out is when you finish paying the instalments’ (Interview April 2011). In the latter statement, goods are consumed and paid at virtually the same time -- they are both tied to a particular timeframe. On the former statement, a new relationship in the consumption process is introduced, that is, consumption as anticipation.

Baudrillard notes that through such forms of consumption, consumer goods appear as ‘*harnessing of power*, not as products embodying work’ (1998: 33 [original emphasis]). The accumulation of items is attributed by many not as a natural consequence of labour, but rather as a mysterious phenomenon difficult to explain, especially for those who have never emigrated. Through accumulation, migrants demarcate their lifestyle from the lifestyle of others, especially from those who cannot afford to consume in anticipation. The compulsion to buy does not simply suggest alienation from commodities and from other people, but is also a reflection of human autonomy, an instrument used to inscribe difference and individuality. Furthermore, by sharing some of these fruits of excess with their close relations, by becoming gifts, these commodities gain the capacity to channel good and generous gestures. Thus, commodities have the capacity to break social and long-established relations but also to become ‘decommodified’ when transformed into a gift (Featherstone 1991: 17). In that sense, we are in the presence of a commodity and a non-commodity simultaneously. However, it cannot be denied that both actions create new limits to the lifestyle of both individuals. Hence, goods act as a marker of social relations and as communicators (see

Baudrillard 1998), including and excluding others from the social settings where such relations take place.

Accumulation, consumption as anticipation, surplus, all come to define a world of excess, where the notion of utility is pushed into secondary place and 'expenditure for nothing' becomes the site of production of meaning and value. Migrants and non-migrants in Brazil reflect on the amount of 'useless items' that other migrants buy in Ireland and who have become accustomed to a system orientated by waste, where 'enough' is not simply 'just enough'. Rather, the suggestion is that one should aim for 'too much', if there is waste then the immediate conclusion is that there is excess, and if there is excess, then there are no needs. This stands in stark contrast to the affluent society which Marshal Sahlins (1972) describes, where, although there was no surplus, hunting-gathering societies were affluent because they were not dominated by scarcity which is a product of modern society. By having 'just enough' which greatly rested on solidarity and trust, hunter-gatherers depended on the stability of human relations and nature for survival. In modern society on the other hand, where there is excess there is never enough, because excess itself is dominated and haunted by its opposite, that is, the fear of not having 'too much', of not being able to consume in anticipation of needs.

The abundance of goods has led to the introduction of increased amounts of non-essentials which many migrants feel have impacted on their diet and on their levels of spending. Vitoria summarises:

In Ireland, because you have more money you buy more nonsense stuff, you buy more Danone, biscuits, things that you don't need. In Brazil you buy more food [rice, beans], the kinds of things you need day-to-day, so things last. In Brazil, if you bought something and it finishes, it's finished. You'll only buy more the following month. In Ireland you eat more nonsense stuff, more soft drinks.
(Interview, December 2010)

And, another migrant adds, 'here you live of consumption and you get fat ... you buy superfluous things ... [In Ireland] if something is finished you just buy more'. Mothers

in particular complain that their children will, for example, open two packs of yoghurts simultaneously to then realise that they are only going to eat one, then either wasting the remaining yoghurt or giving it to the mother who will eat it so it will not go to waste. As the definition of excess evolves, so does the definition of scarcity, and what was once sufficient becomes insufficient. We come to a social order where the division is no longer between the 'haves' and 'have-nots', but between those who can afford to waste and those who cannot. And, upon return, this constitutes one of the fundamental demarcations between those who 'did well' in Ireland and those who did not. Thus, as observed by Baudrillard, the consumer society needs objects so they can be destroyed and notes that 'only in destruction are objects there in excess and only then, in their disappearance, do they attest to wealth' (1998: 49). In a world of abundance, the differences between need and excess fuse into one, creating simulated objects and simulated relationships. However, these signs of wealth, or simulated signs of wealth, either reinforce the affiliation to a social group or alienate individuals.

Commodities are no longer defined by their use-value, but rather they are defined by what they signify, by their sign-value (see Baudrillard 1998). The role of commodities in everyday life is no longer defined by what they do but rather by their relationship with an entire system of relationships between people and objects. For this reason, Featherstone (1991) argues that the consumer society must not only be regarded by an increasing materialism but it also must account for the dream-images that confronts us on a daily basis and which speak of to our desires and aspirations. Many migrants suggest that many of the goods available to them in Ireland are only reserved to 'the rich' in Brazil; Vitoria notes that 'in Brazil, people from my social class, no one wears imported perfume' (Interview, January 2011). These objects, 'sham objects' in Baudrillard's point of view, carry with them the signs of happiness and self-realization, and through them the consumer waits for the signs of happiness to work their magic.

What once was unreal, unachievable, unreachable, now becomes a reality. The enchantment of the new commodities, access to imported perfume, to clothing brands, all enable the possibility to becoming another person. Ireland presents migrants with the new possibilities that the world of consumption allows and with a sense of immediacy and equality never felt before, as illustrated here by one migrant:

[In Ireland] brands like Puma, Reebok, Adidas, Nike are accessible to everyone, and it's all paid in cash. You want to have the things that you can't have in Brazil, or, well you can, but it's absurdly expensive, the kinds of things which you couldn't afford even if you divided it in 10 instalments. [For example, in Ireland] you pay €60 for a pair of runners, in Brazil you pay R\$300 [€96]. (Interview, April 2011)

In consumption, migrants find not only the signs of happiness but also the myth of equality (Baudrillard 1998). Migrants speak about the experiences in Ireland as 'another life' where they can become a different person, the kind of person unshackled from a 'system of privileges' tightly connected to social status. In Ireland, even if idealised, migrants report on feeling a sense of equality, where 'if you want it, you can get it'. This newly found sense of equality is deeply rooted in economic freedom, freedom to believe that one can be an equal. This sense of equality stands in direct opposition to their previous life in Brazil where, as Korin et al. notes, 'the social fabric of the country is maintained by a system of privileges according to social status and racial background. ... In Brazil authority and hierarchy rule.' (Korin et al. 2005: 168)

The sense of equality, however, is only possible through accumulation. The same migrant goes on to say that her husband has over 20 pairs of new branded jeans in his wardrobe. They have never been worn and are there awaiting to be shipped to Brazil, so he can still wear branded jeans when he returns and when he predicts he will not be able to afford them. Accumulation becomes a source of power and therefore a source of inequality, and the disequilibrium caused by it prompts relations of hierarchy

amongst migrants and their families and friends to emerge, and power is gained, maintained or lost through the capacity to keep accumulating such material goods.

In the same logic that a 'marriage of convenience' for Isabelle is not the direct result of rational thought, accumulation also originates in a feeling of anxiety and insecurity. By accumulation I do not mean the economic understanding that Baudrillard gives to the word. Accumulation here does not relate to necessity or calculation, but rather it is a site for the production of value. It is likely that such a big amount of boots or jeans will not be used, the former as the weather will probably not help, and the latter because the person is likely to lose or gain weight, and tastes and fashion are likely to interfere in what is to be worn. Hence, it is not the notion of utility that is here at stake, but the anxiety created by the uncertainty that access to these items may not exist in the future. In the light of this, the superfluous still precedes the necessary.

Luis and Vitoria, as other migrants, have suggested that before emigrating they would have been happier with less, where now 'we always want more'. Whilst it is true that migrants encounter in Ireland a new reality where money is available in greater amounts, it is the levels of consumption, the movement from quantity to differentiation that influences their return and determines their willingness to remain in Brazil. These are also the conditions that lead them to reconsider returning to Ireland. Therefore, the increasing differentiation for social prestige, gained through levels of consumption, is constantly present in their interrelations and shapes their return, and is present in their relationships with persons and objects. Consumption and accumulation enable the migrant to express economic freedom and power. However, upon return the migrant must reinsert himself or herself into a social world where they must conserve a degree of 'aliqueness' to their kinship and friends if they want to remain a part of the social fabric that surrounds them. At the same time, through the migratory process migrants

have experienced the joys of excess and the seduction of wastage, which differentiates them from their circle of relatives and friends.

Shopping and consumption dominates not only domestic spending, but it has also become an important pillar of social life. Featherstone (1991) asserts that our use of time in consumption practices reflects an accurate idea of our class status. One of the difficulties for migrants upon their return to Brazil was the organisation of free time. In Ireland, most Brazilians if they are not working, watch Brazilian television and films in English with Portuguese subtitles, and in the evening go to a party or get together at a relative's or at a friend's house. Free time outside the house is usually centred on a stroll to the shopping centre and a visit to McDonald's, a regular treat that almost all families and single adults remark on. Going to McDonald's in Brazil is expensive; in Ireland eating at McDonald's is not only affordable but has become a regular event for many, as illustrated here:

My daughter loved going to McDonald's. In Ireland, if we went out we could always go to McDonald's for something to eat. Nowadays ... I'm glad that there isn't a McDonald's here in Eptácio ... One of these days we went to Prudente ... and we went to McDonald's, we paid R\$60, for 4 meals ... do you have any idea what R\$60 are? For a regular worker to earn R\$60? Nowadays a daily wage for a general service employee is R\$20, that's what he earns in one day, so, he would have to work for 3 days ... to be able to bring his children to eat a meal [at McDonald's] ... whereas there [in Ireland] you'd earn that money in an hour. (Interview, July 2011)

Going to the shopping centre or to McDonald's in Ireland is easy, whereas the prospect of retaining this same lifestyle in Brazil is unlikely, and this is a great cause of anxiety. Women often speak about being able to buy clothes on a daily basis if they wanted, and consistently refer to the fact that they can afford to buy Coca-Cola and Danone for their children, items which are expensive in Brazil. The prospect of not being able to continue to do this upon return is a cause for great anxiety, and creates the uneasy feeling of returning not to Brazil but to the past.

At the same time, a life heavily based on consumption is also met with a lack of freedom and with living a non-life in Ireland. Mothers in particular voice the disillusionments of a life lived within the confines of what can be bought and sold, and complain that their children are housebound, playing computer games, unable to live a free life playing outside. Children do not play sports outside school because joining a club is perceived as expensive, children do not play outside because the weather is too cold and wet; they eat too much and play too little. One mother summarises her own experience and that of her children:

Financially here is better but here you have no life ... their [the children's] life is the video game. They get obese; they only eat, but don't play. Children grow up and think that everything is easy ... here video games cost €20 or €30. In Brazil they cost R\$200 or R\$300 [between €63 and €94]. Children have everything easy here, I drop them off at school, I pick them up; they aren't seeing life as it really is. (Interview, December 2010)

And the pressure takes other proportions, as illustrated by a mother's description of her child's expectations, when migrants start thinking about returning to Brazil:

I made a big mistake. I would give anything to him, anything, anything I could afford I would give to him, I worked for him, [husband] always said 'that's not right', and now? What am I going to do to set him [the son] straight? It'll be, my God, a big job. Why? Because I got him used to having everything. He's got all the games, all the games released in Ireland, and now? Now he thinks he can do anything. Now I, and his father, are trying to get them from him and we're getting exhausted. To the limit. Why? Because, I know it's my fault, because [his father] isn't the one to blame, because he always told me 'that's not right, it's not right, he'll grow up thinking that he can have anything' and I would say 'Oh, no, I didn't have it, I didn't have it' and now? What's the result? And now I have many headaches. (Interview, April 2011)

Migrants cannot go back to a past of constrained consumption when debts were paid at the beginning of the month and new debts were then contracted. Ireland has become the lived experience of the modern 'First World' where economic freedom can be attained. Economic freedom which is acquired in Ireland and extended to Brazil upon the migrant's return sustains social controls over people's lives. The fears and anxieties created by new standards of living remind migrants that current patterns of

consumption alienates them from their friends and extended families in Brazil; moreover, these patterns are unsustainable upon return. But it also reminds them that their lives have changed in Ireland through the consumption of goods which were unattainable in the past, and reminds them that these experiences take centre stage by which all future experience is to be measured against. The fact is that, as Slavoj Žižek asserts, ‘the excess is with us forever’.⁹

For these reasons, return is not a straight forward decision rather it is full of ambiguity as Lucas illustrates:

I think I’ll find what’s missing here in Brazil, but, at the same time, I’m afraid of missing here, because I like it here, I can’t tell I don’t like it, I’ve been living here for 10 years ... but I believe... I believe, no, I’m sure I like Brazil better, but I don’t know how my life there is going to pan out, because there we have to work harder, the temperature doesn’t help, it’s very hot ... and the work here in Ireland is light ... in Brazil work is much heavier, more pressure, here you’re more relaxed, ... life there is more difficult. (Interview, December 2010)

Even knowing all of this, for Lucas the question of settling permanently in Ireland never really arose, partly because he has planned his return, ‘I have my own business in Brazil, I think this is the main point why I’m going to return, another security that I have’ (Interview, December 2010). Like others in his situation, that is, those migrants who are returning with a profit-making business already running and a guarantee of an income in line with their income in Ireland, Lucas has started a business with family members who were living in Brazil and who had experience in the field. Lucas explains:

This is my business but my brother is the one in charge, I know nothing about what we do here, I built the business on his experience, do you understand? I had the money and I told him ‘What if we set up a business for ourselves? I contribute with the money, and you contribute with your experience, and the business is ours’. So he said yes ... I already had the money to buy a good house, you know? and I wanted to set up a business so I could return and not having to work for anyone else ... so I set up this business [during a holiday], it is ours, with his experience ... I left him with the overall responsibility ... I went to Ireland ... to earn a bit more because I did not want to touch the income from the business as it was only starting, we needed to stabilise the business first. (Interview, August 2011)

⁹ See [http:// https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vydwrn_TQow](http://https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vydwrn_TQow)

The time spent in Ireland during the initial period of the business provided some financial stability and enabled the brothers to invest in the business without incurring debt apart from the day-to-day running of the business itself. This is already a very different outlook on life from when Lucas came to live in Naas and from our conversation in 2006 when he had mentioned that he wanted to buy a truck and work making deliveries in Brazil. As he pointed out closer to his return to Brazil, he could have set up a business with the capital he had saved during the first few years but he also suggests that his mind changed in Ireland, 'Ireland changes the way we think, you mature, I was young, I have matured, and I changed my plans and the ambition was also bigger' (Interview, December 2010). Although Lucas had gathered enough money to start his own business in Brazil by his third year in Ireland, he reflects that the initial idea of buying a truck was somehow immature, an idea which needed to ripen in order to be successful; by 2011 that idea had died and a new one had emerged, one which involved his siblings.

Any of the migrants I met which fell into this profile were young and single. Lucas recognises that emigrating alone without a family of his own gave him the impetus to leave Brazil and enabled him to save money, as 'I was on my own, so who did I have to worry about? Only with myself!' (Interview, July 2011) and admits that this is quite a privileged situation. Equally advantageous was to have someone in Brazil with the professional experience in which they could build a business on. It was a match made in heaven, the migrant had the money and not the experience, and a close relative or sibling had the experience and the market knowledge but not the initial capital to invest in their own business. Most make references to migrants who had returned without a clear plan or without the kind of support that they had, and read it as a step overshadowed by uncertainty and eventual failure. Reflecting on his own situation, Lucas asserts:

No, I'm not afraid of going back anymore because I'm going to work anyhow -- there is a bigger security with my business. With this business or not I know that I will have to work anyway, and I like working ... [so] I already have that security, and because of that I know it's time to go back, and they need me there ... this is another reason why it's time to return definitely. (Interview, December 2010)

After spending almost a decade in Ireland, Lucas knew what he wanted, and he is not afraid to voice it:

I always plan ... I didn't want to return to Brazil and do something I didn't want to, like taking the first job that came along out of necessity, I didn't want that, I wanted something I would like to do or something other than heavy work, because here in Ireland, there is a lot of comfort and the body becomes unfamiliar [with hard work] so you need to be prepared for it when you go back and I was preparing myself, now I think I'm ready. (Interview, December 2010)

For Lucas and others in his same situation, return is not a matter of chance; rather, it is a well considered decision. There is nothing romantic or dreamy about it. It is a sober, measured and realistic decision, nearly uneventful for that reason. It is a decision rooted in the past and triggered by emotional connections to Presidente Epitácio and family life often mixed with the sense of what has been lost during the years spent in Ireland, in many occasions the loss of a parent or close family members as Lucas explains:

That's another reason to return to Brazil, I'm afraid of losing my parents ... I believe that's it [losing time], that's what I'm trying to say, that there is something missing here, and it seems that you have stopped living. In Brazil there are people close to us like parents, siblings, [pause] I think this is the happiness that is missing, that is, that item that you can't identify, that you call happiness, the people you love, that love you, and they are away. (Interview, December 2010)

Whilst the decision to return is emotionally rooted in the past and daily life is projected into the future, the decision to return is deeply rationalized in the present, almost as a balance sheet of opportunities and costs, and for this reason there is a certain momentum and decidedness in the decision to return when the balance is very positive.

Return, and more importantly, the prospect of permanent return to Brazil are therefore measured in terms of financial achievements:

I achieved more [than what initially planned], when we come, I had a small vision of what I wanted, I think the human being is very ambitious, when you get here, you see you can have more, and we always want more, isn't it? ... It was difficult [decision to return to Brazil] but it was a fundamental step in my life, I have learnt a lot here, I think I mentioned it to you before, I'm very grateful to Ireland and I will be grateful for the rest of my life because nothing in my life has been easy, everything has been very difficult, [but] thanks to God, today I have a life that is not as difficult, but I think it is a fruit of what I have planted, we always harvest what we have planted, but I, I'm happy, I think I could have achieved more ... but I believe I still achieved what I wanted, not exactly what I wanted but I achieved more than what I expected. (Interview, December 2010)

For Lucas the decision to return to Brazil is just another step of a long-term plan, he does not consider returning to Ireland, although he never fully excludes this possibility especially when re-imagining that life in Brazil may represent a step into the past. He quickly points out that he will have no problem returning to Ireland if he needs money but equally adds that he does not believe that will happen. He wants comfort, in fact he says:

Comfort is the main thing ... comfort is to have a comfortable house, a car, a job that gives security, like my own business, if it continues to go as it is at the moment as it is going well, and if it pleases god it will continue that way, that's what I need, a good house and a car, and a job of course ... [Also] It's very important to have savings ... to have a bit of money for a rainy day ... [because] you can't go to Brazil with money only for a house, a car and a job, you never know what tomorrow will bring, there are always unexpected things that happen, illness, something and you need to have a security, that's very important. (Interview, December 2010)

Lucas also believes that there are other more important things, like for example starting a family in Brazil, 'I don't think of coming back because I want to start a family, I have a girlfriend ... we met here'. And his belief that this is the right time to return to Brazil, for financial and family reasons, is reflected in his decision not to apply for Irish citizenship which would have given him access to the European labour market. Lucas is so sure about his return to Brazil that he says that although he would like to

have an Irish passport this would involve postponing his return for a couple of years, but he believes he will not need the passport and decides that this is secondary to his plans. He recognises that having a European passport is a security:

The [Irish] passport is a security ... more than stamp 4, the passport is forever ... I can return [to Ireland] and renew my stamp 4 but I believe it won't come to that, but I'll have time to think about it ... before it expires I'll have time in Brazil to think if this is what I want, if I want a further security, because I'm going back but if I need, of course, the following day I'll come back to Ireland because I know that here I have a security, but I pray to God, and I'm certain, well not certain, but I pray to God, I hope I won't need to come back, but if I do, I'll come back. (Interview, December 2010)

This purposefulness in making his return to Brazil work is partly due to Lucas's financial achievements, but there is a sense that emigration is more than an event, rather it is a continuum of life lessons only possible away from the protective eyes and arms of close family and childhood friends. Living away implies trying and losing the fear of possible failure partly because there is no one to help and partly because there is no one to judge. Lucas reflects:

I learnt a lot in Ireland, I expanded the way I look at the world, expanded my mind, I believe this will help me a lot in Brazil. Because when I came here I didn't have a vision of life, I don't know if it's because I was young, Ireland teaches you how to live away from your parents, away from your friends, the people you love, you learn how to make it on your own ... there are things that I learnt to do here, if I had been in Brazil I think I wouldn't have tried ... you learn because you have to ... you learn how to live ... when I came to Ireland I didn't know how to do anything. ... I learnt how to live, not to be afraid of obstacles, when obstacles come to you [pause] they called it a 'skill' ... you learn how to move forward, to live, the kind of things that, maybe, if I were in Brazil I wouldn't bother trying to learn. Here you learn that you are capable, you need to fight ... it is 'maturing'. (Interview, December 2010)

And, he continues:

I believe it was Ireland, I don't know if I would have had this kind of 'maturing' in Brazil, maybe in Brazil I would have had a more conformist life, I don't know, but I believe it was Ireland who gave me this ... when you are alone you fight harder ... I think that when you're at home, you're protected, you don't go after things as hard, in a way you are protected and when you leave, you're on our own. The world, is the whole world against you, you have to make it, you have to learn, you can't be conformist, you have to ... it's a way of fighting ... I'd say it's a human being's instinct ... but many are fearful of risking, so ... you

conform to that: I have my job, why looking for something else, why risking? But it shouldn't be like that, you must look for things, to take risks, otherwise you'll never move forward. (Interview, December 2010)

The instinct that makes Lucas fight is one which he found and developed in Ireland and gives him the strength to believe that if he has made it in Ireland there is no reason why he will not succeed in Brazil upon his return. He sees the fear of a 'life without comfort' in the eyes of other migrants, especially those who came with their families:

You know, what ties people here [Ireland] is fear ... many would like to go back but are afraid of facing life in Brazil ...it's all fear, because if you get there and you fight, if you run after things and you have the courage to work hard, there will be no difficulties, here or in Brazil. (Interview, December 2010)

But fear is contagious and fighting is tiresome, and Lucas knows the experience of those who have returned to Brazil only to come back to Ireland a few months later.

You see, there were many cases of people who were here then returned to Brazil, and after came back. This is taken by many as an example, they're afraid of going back. First they think it's time to go back, and then they get there and have to come back to Ireland again, because here isn't bad, but it's like we're doing penance ... [in Ireland] there is comfort, there is everything that is good, but there is something missing and that is something you only find in Brazil. So, many people are afraid of going back to Brazil and not adapting there, well it's not that they won't adapt, because without a question you'll adapt to Brazil, but Brazil ... you see, life in Brazil is difficult and because of that many are afraid of going back and having to work in the first job that comes along for lack of options, and then they live in this fear ... I believe that the majority [fear return] in the financial sense, ... it's a financial question, absolutely it's a financial question, because in Ireland everything is easy, it's like I said: an easy life, and in Brazil nothing is easy, nothing, if you don't have some money to start your own business or have an education to find a good job, that's why people are afraid of not finding a job, of having to work hard. (Interview, December 2010)

Upon return the migrant strives not to remain a meat factory worker or not having to take the first job that comes along; he is aiming at becoming self-employed and improving his financial and social status. The migrant may have migrated to buy a house but as Sayad notes 'emigration modified a whole lifestyle by modifying disposition towards the economy in particular' (1999: 38) which seem to take focus on

modes of consumption. Migrants' evaluations of their time in Ireland are a reflection of what migration enabled them to do, migration here seen as a punctual and discontinuous moment in time which enabled them to 'gain' or 'lose' time measured through money, and is also a reflection of the continuous implications that the movement to Ireland have on their lives and on their return to Brazil. These evaluations are always done on a personal level in relation to the alternatives they had in Brazil and the costs paid by emigrating; they are also collective representations of time and person in relation to opportunity-costs derived from moving to Ireland and moving back to Brazil. Alfred Gell observes that 'once we start to judge actions and outcomes in the actual world against the imaginary standard of alternative scenarios stemming from once open but subsequently closed possibilities, we enter an area of radical uncertainty' (1992: 219). Uncertainty is indeed a common element in the everyday life of most Brazilian migrants because every evaluation of return -- and it must be clear that this is a constant theme of daily life, is consistently based on the relation between past and current actions and their impact on the future. This is not only a sequential evaluation of events but the outcomes from the process of migration are judged as successful or unsuccessful by a wider community of migrants and their kin in Brazil. Hence, success is not only linear, something that happened in the past and continues in the present, but it is also indicative of a certain type of personhood. In Ireland migrants come to experience a new kind of modernity and are exposed to new forms of consumption which will not be a possibility when they return to Brazil. These evaluations are not a direct equation between costs and benefits in the economic sense, but they include and measure all the other secondary phenomena which I have tried to examine here. Therefore, as return is being considered on the everyday, these moments are times of uncertainty because the measurement of what is being considered does not quantify objective actions in time. Rather, what is being considered are all the other alternatives of what is and of what

could have been.

CHAPTER 4

Melancholia and the loss of desire

In 1990-1991, Rede Globo, arguably the best known Brazilian broadcaster, aired the *telenovela*, soap opera, 'Meu bem, Meu mal'. In it, Doca a poor and innocent young man whose accent and manner leaves nothing to the imagination about his humble origins agrees to take part in a revenge plan orchestrated by the 'socialite' Mimi Toledo and her manicurist, to infiltrate 'high society' and seduce a 'rich' girl. In the process, Doca has to learn how to speak, eat, sit, dress, think and behave, in such a way that his old identity as Doca does not betray his newly constructed persona. In what, at times, seems like an impossible job, Mimi and her manicurist shape Doca's new identity so that he is finally ready to face 'high society'; the only detail left to be discussed is what name he is going to adopt. The three of them, pace around the sitting room thinking about an appropriate first name and surname which will evoke distinction, status, uniqueness. After much thinking, Doca has, what for an instant seems to the others, a Eureka moment and shouts something along these lines, 'I know, what about José da Silva?' Mimi and the manicurist look perplexed at Doca and start to question if he has indeed learnt anything with them as José da Silva is possibly the most common name in the whole Portuguese language. At that point, between laughs and slight worry, the moment of tension is created for the viewer, who from then on will sit on the edge of the chair waiting for Doca, now Eduardo Costabrava, to make a similar mistake. The bottom line is that whilst Doca's exterior could be changed, and manners and demeanour could be taught, his way of being and understanding the world was imprinted in him. This moment marks a point of uncertainty and ambiguity in the character's identity, when the viewer is reminded that one can polish and groom the outer layers which can deceive the most critical eyes for a period of time but that, when all is said and done, one is who he is, trapped in the limits of one's social world and nothing more.

The relevance of this episode is the fact that *telenovelas* and their narratives are a strong reflection of the tensions and complexities between Brazilian social and economic classes, and are a constant presence in daily conversations and jokes (see Rabanea 2013). They are so addictive that in 2012, Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff chose to cancel her plans to attend an election rally ‘fearing the turn-out would be a fiasco’, at the same time that Brazil’s power stations got ready for an increase in demand as Brazilians gathered to watch the last developments of ‘Avenida Brasil’, another *telenovela* (see Carneiro 2012).

Brazilian migrants returning to Presidente Epitácio face similar moments of ambiguity and their return is marked by the coming to terms with the uncertainty about their place in the world, about what they are expected to be and who they see themselves as being. This chapter addresses these ambiguities and disconnections created by the boundaries imposed by the self and the contours of an ever changing social world. As we explore if the notion of melancholia is the best term to capture these social transformations and these transformations of the self, it seems helpful to first map out forms of discontent in the context of return migration.

Upon return, migrants are confronted with a faded social context which breaks with their own memories and notions of familiarity and naturalness from their past, and with former ways of being in the world. Returning requires re-acquaintance with old life trajectories and requires the learning of new points of reference which, for others around, are just pure and simple common sense. For those sharing a particular version of common sense there is little ambiguity and little conflict in what common sense supports and denies, it ‘presents reality neat’. Geertz notes that ‘common sense rests its [case] on the assertion that it is not a case at all, just life in a nutshell. The world is its authority’ (1983: 76). In that sense, he continues, ‘when we say someone shows common sense we mean to suggest more than that he is just using his eyes and ears, but

... he is capable of coping with everyday problems in an everyday way with some effectiveness' (1983: 77). Those who, on the other hand, are unable or unwilling to 'apprehend the sheer actualities of experience' and are unable or unwilling to come to 'sensible conclusions' are ostracized or alienate themselves from the wider social world.

As Bauman suggests, these assumptions seem:

Deeply moral in its consequences, since it postulates the essential similarity of human beings and assigns to the other the qualities of subjects just like our own subjectivity. And yet, to hold fast, this assumption of "reciprocal perspectives" must rest on a still deeper presupposition: that it is not just me who assumes reciprocity of perspective and behaves accordingly - but that this assumption of reciprocity is itself reciprocated. (Bauman 1998: 10)

This requires empathy in the sense that one must 'imagine that I myself would perform analogous acts if I were in the same situation' (Schuetz cited in Bauman 1998: 10).

However, as migrants have pointed out repeatedly, they have lived in a 'First World' country and their perspectives about life have changed. Likewise, as suggested by relatives of those who emigrated, when their relatives come back they have become estranged to them and to their ways of thinking and acting, they are not necessarily total strangers, but the intimacy and complicity at the basis of their former relationships, the cognitive, moral and aesthetic map of the world has been altered (see Bauman 1998).

And, thus, families and migrants alike find it difficult to assume reciprocal perspectives; there is less common ground and more distance and uncertainty. As Bauman also suggests, the arrival of the stranger, or in this case the arrival of the stranger who was once familiar, 'shatters the rock on which the security of daily life rests' (1998: 11). By their very presence and their often comparisons between Brazil which is associated with poverty, dirtiness, impoliteness and backwardness, and Ireland seen as the 'First World', prosperity and cleanness, migrants blur the lines of what otherwise would have been straightforward and remind others of what they do not have in common anymore.

In that sense, the question for migrants is not about forgetting the past in Ireland or

living in a permanent state of uncertainty in Brazil; the question is ‘how to live with alterity - daily and permanently’, as Bauman rightly observes (see 1998: 31).

The familiar notions which enable effective and sensible decisions in a particular social world through which social life is worked out, are the basis for recognisability and empathy. But, as João Biehl (2005) suggests in his work on the ‘burden of care’ experienced by families in the face of economic precariousness ‘what kind of subjectivity is possible when one is no longer marked by the dynamics of recognition or by temporality?’ (2005: 11). This is a central question for Brazilian migrants who return to Presidente Epitácio, as is the means through which context and meaning must be accommodated after years spent abroad.

In a study about Thai women migrating from rural Thailand to Bangkok and their subsequent return, Mary Beth Mills (1997) notes that although women expressed ambivalent feelings about their migration from rural Thailand to Bangkok, the prospect of return was not without its difficulties, and if life in the city presented its problems, returning raised a whole different set of anxieties positioned between the moral impetus to return and fulfil familial obligations, and the individual desire for autonomy and consumption. John W. Traphagan (2000) makes a similar point focusing on the tensions and interplay of intergenerational power and the various obligations that shape the experience of return migration from metropolitan areas in Japan to areas considered to be rural. Other authors have explored the ambivalences of return in transnational movements. Olsson (2008) and Sardinha (2008) both reflect on the ambiguous feelings of familiarity, often expressed as a return ‘home’, whilst at the same time being confronted with feelings of strangeness leading to comparisons between the two countries; Ramji (2006) highlights the ‘contradictory longings’ (647) that permeate the return of first-generation British Hindu Gujaratis to India and their attempts to negotiate ‘retirement back home’. Ramji notes that after years of formulating a ‘mythologized

home' which is at odds with the real place of return, return migrants find that they are considered by others who have not emigrated as 'inbetween placeness' and, in this scenario, 'London gained clarity as a source of identity' (647).

Return, in that sense, is never seamless. The first few months and in many cases, the first couple of years of the migrant's return to Brazil, whether following a well planned or an impulsive decision to return, is nearly always articulated by migrants as a difficult time (see Martes 2000). Luis and Vitoria speak about being 'out of pace' with life in Brazil and feeling the presence of a void, a lack of something which they cannot articulate. Vitoria in particular explains that she feels slightly adrift and has the memory of her life in Ireland permanently stuck in her head, almost as a haunting thought: 'we're still a bit lost, we're still a little bit out of pace, we're not as if we're fully at home' (Interview, July 2011).

As we sat and spoke about Ireland and Brazil, it was clear that for Luis and Vitoria the memories of their life in Ireland remained very much alive, and that they held ambivalent feelings about their return to Brazil. They had made a conscious decision to return, something that they had been mulling over for some time but which was prompted by the closure of the meat factory where Luis worked. Many other Brazilian migrants were in the same situation and many returned to Brazil at roughly the same time. Luis and Vitoria were in a privileged situation, as they acknowledged. They were returning to Brazil in a stable financial situation and whilst the closure of the meat factory may have prompted their return, it did not interfere with their plans as they were already planning returning to Brazil. They also had an option to remain in Ireland and collect social welfare or look for other job as Luis's immigration status enabled him to do both, but they chose Brazil.

Saying good-bye to Ireland was not as easy as Luis and Vitoria had imagined, 'it was difficult to leave, to leave it all, it's like if we had left a piece of our life behind'

(Interview, July 2011). And, now they are questioning if they should return to Ireland to attempt to recover that piece, although they find it difficult to explain what exactly they have left behind and what exactly they would like to recover, as illustrated here:

People think that “Oh, they have no reason to be feeling that way, their situation is very comfortable”, and to be truthful I know that there are people in worst situations ... we’re fine ... but I miss something ... sometimes we’re here in the sitting-room and we’d say “now we would have been in such and such a place”, we keep thinking about Ireland, the things we could be doing there, that we could be visiting Dublin, or we could be in the shopping centre, and we’d say “we’d be in McDonald’s”, and then each of us will start talking about the different places, isn’t it? And slowly we go back there, do you understand? ... So here we see these difficulties ... here, unfortunately, salaries are very low ... only professionals or politicians have a good wage ... because a shop assistant, a clerk, any person working in local businesses, they all earn a minimum salary. (Interview, July 2011)

In these imaginary processes of going back and forth to Ireland, Luis and Vitoria start remembering all the things that they used to do and which are unaffordable in Brazil on a regular basis. Contrary to what this statement might suggest, their return to Brazil was planned and voluntary, it was meant to be a new beginning for Luis and Vitoria, which is partly why Vitoria cannot explain why she cannot feel ‘fully at home’. Others like Raul, a man in his 30s, talk about depression, of coming back a different person, of ‘coming back with different values’ and of the difficulties of negotiating these new values with those around (see Martes 2000). As Georg Simmel (2011[1978]) has observed and Bauman remarks (1998: 4), ‘any value is a value ... only thanks to the loss of other values one must suffer in order to obtain it. But you need most what you lack most.’

Raul, who had returned to Brazil nearly one year before we sat down for a formal recorded conversation, reflects on what he sees as his inability to take sensible decisions upon his return to Brazil: ‘my problem is that I want to be more than what I really am’ (Interview, July 2011). Wanting to be ‘more’ puts Raul at odds with those around him who struggle to understand why he feels down on himself when he seems to

have everything to be happy, a house, a steady income from renting property, a car, in other words he has everything he could wish for and more. Rather than looking to the outer world for possible answers, Raul sees himself as failing to understand his own way of thinking and blames himself for what he feels is his inability to reconnect with Brazil:

Returning was, it was difficult, bad, I haven't been able to find myself ... but I don't blame Brazil, I don't blame the people, I blame myself, I'm the only one to blame, my way of thinking. (Interview, July 2011)

For Raul, the world has become a strange place, where his way of thinking, his ability to make sensible decisions based on the 'actualities of experience' has considerably diminished. For him, return to Brazil must be part of a process of restoration, which must consider the irreversibility of lost links and the experience of an internal void which puts him at odds with the social world around him. In a world deeply organised around a system of privileges according to social status (Korin et al. 2005: 168), Raul, like Doca in the *telenovela*, wants to play the character of Eduardo Costabrava but everything around him reminds him that all he can aspire to be is just another José da Silva.

In her ethnography *The Pastoral Clinic*, Angela Garcia (2010) explores the ways in which loss and melancholia provide not only a metaphor for heroin addiction but also as a way to trace 'a kind of chronology, a temporality, of it' (7). Drawing on her analysis, I understand the decision to return to Brazil, a decision initially charged with aspirations and hopefulness, as morally charged and which ultimately gives rise to new forms of subjectivity largely framed by instances of loss. But whilst Garcia's informants speak not of uncertainty but of fixity in the sense that their lives are a struggle 'without end' (18), Brazilian migrants upon return speak as much of uncertainty -- of not being able to 'find' oneself, as of ideas of 'fixity'-- of all those things that are perceived as having remained the same. Whilst the narratives of return often relate experiences of

uncertainty about one's place in the world, they also tell of instances when the migrant feels 'trapped' in the fixity of a life that 'will always be this way'. Thus, the past, as Garcia notes, 'remains a fundamental force in the everyday experience' (110), a past which is experienced as painful and endless. And, in the same way that 'the complexity of addictive experience, especially as it is shared within families, creates new "codes of conduct"' (121), so too, the complexity of the migratory process creates new ways of being in the world precisely because 'we are constituted in relationality: implicated, beholden, derived, sustained by a social world that is beyond us and before us' (Butler cited in Garcia 2010: 121).

As Garcia observes, 'life is not lived in the singular' (152) -- although I prefer to think of it as life not being lived *only* in the singular, and upon return, migrants are confronted with their own thinking and internal judgements, but also with the emergence of a split between the self and a social context previously familiar which is now fading away. Under the lenses of social gaze, migrants' lifestyles are scrutinized. For those like Raul or Luis and Vitoria, not being able to enjoy their return and to 'adapt' to their lives in Brazil becomes an integral part of their internal guilt and social scrutiny. In *Melancholia of Freedom*, Blom Hansen (2012) suggests that the legacy of apartheid regulation and cultural policy left a form of imprinted social scrutiny and social gaze which is visible in everyday life. The anxieties that such gazes impose on the everyday create sites where conflict and moral debate take place. A similar argument could be made about Brazilian migrants returning to Presidente Epitácio, where the pressures of return are framed within the limitations imposed by 'imprinted gazes', the scrutinizing eyes of others and the demands and anxieties imposed by them.

Return migrants are particularly at the centre of this social gaze. They are expected to fulfil a similar role to the one they had when they were on holidays. As Alice notes:

For people who come back from Ireland on holidays, my god, people who are there legally, when they come on holidays for one month it's all partying ... so if someone hears that so and so has come back from Ireland they'll say "I'll go to visit so and so, he came from Ireland, there will be a barbecue and lots of beer". And do you know why this is? Because people come with loads of money to spend, right? Some don't even have the money and put it all on their credit card and then return there [Ireland] to pay it off ... some people rent cars, spend a lot, ... they return [to Brazil] and pretend that, you know, driving a car, they want to look like, you know, new clothes, do you understand? they want to show that, it's like "I've been to a first world country, I have a lot of money" ... people stop being humble, the majority stop being humble. (Interview, June 2011)

The image of the 'successful migrant' and their lifestyle when on holidays in Brazil -- which is a distorted version of their lives in Ireland, made it even more difficult for Alice to explain and make sense of her own situation, and in the eyes of non-migrants she was stingy and selfish. Pierre Bourdieu's (1984; see also Featherstone 1991) concept of *habitus* is helpful when thinking about sources of distinction and the spaces where cultural goods and practices are inscribed, not only on the level of everyday knowledge but also the body itself. However, the central place that class has on his analysis seems to confine the discussion to social aspects. In the case of return migrants, it seems helpful and necessary to include a discussion about the self, as well as the consequences and implications of the contact with a certain kind of modernity experienced in Ireland. In the initial stages of migration, what migrants were looking for in Ireland was not 'distinction' or a new sort of lifestyle, but rather they were looking for sameness. What migrants were looking for was, as they often repeated, 'a house, the same as everyone else'. Every migrant wanted to have a house, and they were specific about it, not a big house or a small house, but a regular house to live in.

Migration, however, presented migrants with new possibilities; one such possibility was the prospect of having more, as Lucas so clearly illustrates:

I think I won in life ... I have learnt how to live, to enjoy myself now. I never had access to anything, so I learnt how to fight for something better. (Interview, December 2010)

In Ireland', he says, 'I opened my mind, I would have never done anything like this, travelling and seeing other things'. Travelling and seeing other things are actions out of reach to most, if not all, of his relatives and friends who did not emigrate. In fact, if they have access to some imported material goods or if they have gone on holidays to other places in Brazil is precisely because Lucas has made it possible. In that regard, the consumption of commodities is mediated by cultural images (Featherstone 1991) and, in the case of return migration, through over-spending during holidays in Brazil. Thus, material goods are not merely utilities but are also communicators of a particular lifestyle.

By the time we met in Presidente Epitácio, Alice had been in Brazil for a year. As she had little experience working in Brazil and she couldn't return to her previous job, Alice found herself in Brazil without a job, with a year gap in her *Curriculum Vitae*, little working experience, no qualifications, no entitlement to social welfare, and no money. For nearly a year, she did sporadic jobs which paid for day-to-day expenses, and lived with relatives. Although there is some resignation in her voice she feels that being in Brazil is a better place for her:

You know, the year I was there [Ireland] I didn't really take advantage of it because I think I didn't live, I didn't live because I stayed at home all the time, sometimes I would get some work but most of the time I was at home. So, even being unemployed here at least I'm close to my friends, my relatives, so at least the happiness is bigger here. (Interview, June 2011)

When Alice arrived, the first few days were spent revisiting all the things she missed while she was in Ireland such as going to the river and visiting friends, as she illustrates here:

I did all the things we don't do there ... little things from the Brazilian everyday ... going out ... because there [Ireland] I didn't have anywhere to go, I didn't have friends ... not like the friends you have here where you know a lot of people ... the kind of things Brazilians like to do, like a *churrasquinho*, things like on a day like today it's sunny and you invite your friends to a barbecue ... there's nothing like this in Ireland, here you do these things in the open air, there you roast chicken in the oven, isn't it? Here in Brazil life is very good, people

only stay in Ireland because of the money, thinking about the future'. (Interview, June 2011)

However, for Alice, the first few months upon return to Brazil were also filled with a sense of shame precisely because her lifestyle did not match the image of the 'successful migrant':

At the beginning, people would say half-jokingly "you came back from Ireland, you're full of money, aren't you? Are you not going to invite us to a beer?" and I would say "no, [Ireland] isn't good", people would joke and would want me to pay for things and saying "are you not going to pay? But you were in Ireland" ... and I would say "I was in Ireland but things there are different", but people would still joke, like thinking that everyone that goes to Ireland comes back with money. (Interview, June 2011)

Alice has ambivalent feelings towards her year spent in Ireland. In the same sentence she might say that she was wasting her time in Ireland, a place that made her feel like a 'mute', and soon after she points out that in Ireland she saw a different world, the 'First World' as she and many others refer to Europe, and she misses this world too. In Brazil, Alice is surrounded by friends and relatives but is reminded that she did not do well in Ireland, and for those like her, and there are many, the return is problematic and filled with sentiments of shame and loss, mixed with relief for being in a familiar place. For them, the first year of being back in Brazil is often lived in a permanent state of uncertainty and of 'feeling observed', a time when the migrant questions herself and starts wondering why exactly she returned to Brazil. This period is often filled with such doubt that many start questioning their own decisions and the decisions that had been taken for them by their families, and their everyday oscillates between regret and happiness which often comes across as instability, aloofness and lack of gratitude to non-migrants.

Luis and Vitoria equally comment on the pressure imposed by the gaze of others. Although in Naas they might have cycled, in Presidente Epitácio they find it difficult to swim against a tide of social prejudice and feel that only someone with a

very strong personality would venture to cycle in Presidente Epitácio without feeling embarrassed or ashamed:

People look at us differently and start imagining “maybe they had to sell the car” ... they’ll stare, gossip ... you lose the will to do those things even if you want to do them ... it’s very strange, isn’t it? ... we found it strange [upon return] we lived in the first world and then you come here ... we knew about it but now we see it with different eyes. (Interview, July 2011)

Through the gaze of others, Alice and Raul are made into ‘parvenus’ (Bauman 1998: 73) who carry an imaginary ‘just arrived’ label. Contrary to Bauman’s ‘parvenu’, Alice and Raul are not strangers to the place -- Presidente Epitácio, but the same logic applies. By the very fact that they once left and by refusing ‘the comfort of arrival’ (Bauman 1998: 78), they are now not fully of the place. Alice, the newly arrived, fears return because she has failed in her quest for financial prosperity in Ireland; and equally, Raul fears return because he ‘succeeded too spectacularly for the comfort of those around’ (Ibid: 79).

In Alice’s situation, being looked through the lenses of the ‘successful migrant’ was particularly hurtful since she had returned to Brazil with less than she had before and could hardly afford her own expenses let alone invite others to socialise. It was not only close friends or family whom she had to face, but ‘friends’ whom she had never seen before would ‘show up from everywhere’. When it came to explaining her own situation Alice was often evasive about her experience in Ireland:

I was vague about it. I didn’t explain ... I didn’t speak about the details to anyone, people were curious to know about it, right? Like saying “what happened that you came back? ... how come you went there and you didn’t achieve anything? How much did you save?” (Interview, June 2011)

These questions did not come as a surprise to Alice. Even when she was still in Ireland, she knew her financial situation would be scrutinized and be a talked about issue upon her return. However, there was not much she could do about it and not much she could do that might have prevented her from being upset:

You feel, like, you dread having to talk about it, you know? You get a bit annoyed ... about the subject because nothing came out of it [time spent in Ireland], nothing ... so I was afraid of coming back and people would be making fun, taking the piss, you know? But now it's ok, I kept pressing on, to survive at least, that's it. (Interview, June 2011)

Recently her luck turned and these memories are being left in the past. Alice was able to find a legitimate tax paying job working in a local business, and she talks about it in these terms:

From here on the only thing is to keep working, isn't it? To work and to be content with the little you earn which is not much but it's enough to live. It's not enough to buy a house ... because the salary is very low ... to pay [for bills, clothing and daily essentials] you need to earn more than R\$1,000 ... and even still it's tight, and I'm earning R\$800 ... which, in any case, is more than the minimum salary. (Interview, June 2011)

She does not consider emigrating again and is adamant that if she ever does she would want to go with a job and work permit in hand, and advises everyone to do the same.

Paradoxically, migrants who returned in a comfortable and stable financial situation make similar remarks about feelings of shame and guilt albeit for different reasons, as Raul explains:

I came back and you have that feeling "it's going to be ok, I have my things", right? Thinking that I had enough [money] for me to get by, I wouldn't be like others, I would make it ... but I got a very big surprise when I came back, because, like, I came back but I wasn't on holidays anymore, I didn't have that shield, I felt completely lost, as you can tell, I'm living the reality again, I felt like, as if the world had gone dark. (Interview, July 2011)

The shield Raul talks about is a virtual barrier which protected him from the reality in Brazil. Protected by this imaginary shield, Raul felt safe and was able to re-imagine himself as a different person, free from social constraints and financial hardship, and he experienced reality with a sense of freedom that was unmatched by living in Ireland or Brazil alone. Rather, it is the combination of these two possibilities -- the movement between Ireland and Brazil, which make the existence of the shield possible. Upon 'permanent' return to Brazil, the migrant is forced to make a decision, and attachment to

Ireland should not be enunciated publicly, and references to forms of life in Ireland must be repressed and shared only in intimate conversations with other returned migrants with whom empathy is possible. Hence, return to Brazil is experienced as a general melancholic condition shared by those who emigrated. This melancholic condition is precisely the effect produced by those things which cannot be stated in public, 'a loss prior to speech and declaration' (Butler 1997: 170). This is a conscious self-imposed state of muteness, such as Alice's replies to non-migrants in Brazil which were often evasive and inexplicit. For this reason, the lack of a social space where such grief could be openly articulated registers a loss of speech (Butler 1997: 184) and imposes limits on how experiences in Ireland are to be voiced upon return. It is important to stress that these limits were not directly or purposely imposed, but are a survival and protection mechanism imposed by all parties. The attachment to Ireland, the experience of 'equality', 'economic freedom' or the 'First World' cannot be publicly acknowledged as it would clash with the world views of those for whom the migrant has returned to. Raul explains these perceptions clearly:

Whether you like it or not, we feel the status from living in a different place, you know? You get here, right, it's not that you don't want to, it's not that, it's the fact that you feel the status, you feel safe ... when you come on holidays you are shielded from the problems from here ... because the problems from here were not my problems, so I felt comfortable. (Interview, July 2011)

Like Bauman's 'tourist', whilst on holidays in Brazil, Raul is in control of his own life, he has the ability and the freedom to dip in and out of the reality presented to him in Brazil as he would return to a different reality in Ireland. Raul had, what Bauman calls 'situational control', that is, the 'ability to choose where and with what parts of the world to 'interface' and when to switch off the connection' but, of course, this picking and choosing of what to be part of and what to exclude 'brings about uncertainties of its own' (Bauman 1998: 92). Raul felt comfortable and safe when on holidays in Brazil,

and for the first time he saw his former life in Brazil with different eyes which he now sees as diminishing:

Everywhere you go you see poverty, I mean there are different places, Brazil is very rich, but for us, people who live the kind of life that we have, I mean, this social class that we have, right? It doesn't matter, you can even go to Ireland and achieve something, but, your lifestyle when you come back, you're gonna have to, how should I put this? You're gonna have to go back to what it was before, do you know? Maybe you even achieved something, but it's not enough to change your life completely. (Interview, July 2011)

The question is: how is the possibility of a different life, of the pursuit of happiness for someone who seems to others to have it all, of a reconciliation with a follow-up life to the one lived in the 'First World' effectively negotiated in Brazil without migrants taking the risk of being ostracized or alienating themselves by their experiences of modernity in Ireland? As Bauman so eloquently puts it:

A different arrangement of human affairs is not necessarily a step forward on the road to greater happiness -- it only seems to be such at the moment it is being made. Re-evaluation of all values is a happy, exhilarating moment, but the re-evaluated values do not necessarily guarantee a state of bliss. (1998: 4-5)

The initial stage of migration can be seen as a detour on the life of a 'pilgrim', to continue with Bauman's metaphor, when the migrant had clear goals which he wanted to achieve. For the vast majority, if not all, the goal was to buy their own house, and with time even buy another house they could rent out upon return and complement their income in Brazil. Upon return, migrants who have only achieved their initial goal reorient their lives towards the same goals they had pre-migration, that is, to work which involved, more likely than not, a return to their previous job in the meat factory, and support their families. But, for those who have been touched by a particular type of modernity in Ireland and who have tasted the flavours of consumption such as Raul and, Luis and Vitoria, Ireland has become an episode which the migrant is never certain that there is not a 'to be continued' at the end of their return. For Raul, and so many like him, returning to his previous job in Brazil represents a step backwards, and when asked

if he would consider returning to the meat factory in Brazil to do the same job he did in Ireland, he replies, '[T]he meat factory here? (laughs) No, it's pride, pride because I was in Ireland' (Interview, July 2011). Raul, who like other migrants does not actually need to work as he is able to make a good living out of the property investments that he has made, retreats into a melancholic state, 'la maladie', the ill-being' as Abdelmalek Sayad calls it, and denies himself that 'saving function or even a therapeutic function' (1999: 142) which work could provide him with. He then finds himself incapable of reinvesting his life with meaning, and forgets that 'there is another way to live, and forgets that life means living other than by striving to live. Necessity and freedom!' (1999: 143). In these circumstances, return requires a rethinking of his life objectives which presuppose a re-evaluation of his whole life:

What am I going to do here in Brazil? I have no qualifications, I don't have a degree, so what do I have? Only the meat factory. Here you see reality, you earn this little, so we get scared ... I would have to come back to reality, back to poverty let's say, you know? Not only poverty in money terms, but the social side which we have here. It's not that there [in Ireland] I was rich, but I had a comfortable life, I felt free from this *cobrança* [charging], I felt free. (Interview, July 2011)

Here is where the statement made by the Brazilian official to Ireland -- which I discuss in chapter one, who claimed that once in Brazil migrants are at home and suggested an unproblematic reinsertion into life in Brazil, becomes indeed problematic. Return demands re-ordering the social world, and the coming to terms with the out-of-placeness of one's behaviours, thoughts and actions; it requires dealing with the 'gestation of uncertainty' and requires the very personal and intimate challenge of dealing with the void created by the possibility of a different life. Upon return, migrants must reacquaint themselves with the 'appropriate' order of things, and reorient their lives away from those things which, although common sense and 'normal' in Ireland, are 'out of place' in Brazil.

After spending a decade in Ireland where nearly everything that Luis and Vitoria bought was paid in cash, returning to the cycle of *deixar pendurado* (leaving debts pending), was difficult to getting used to as illustrated in the following quote:

When we arrived we had to buy a few things ... we checked the amount and, say for example that we're talking about R\$4,500 in cash [roughly €1,470] which would come to R\$4,700 [€1,550] on credit ... we had arrived from Ireland and we didn't want to owe anything, so we paid in cash ... whereas no one is ever going to do this in Brazil, they're going to divide it in 17 or 20 instalments ... but then we started thinking about it and do you know what? It actually makes sense because the difference is so small that you get from paying in cash that people prefer to pay small money instead of paying it all in one go ... which leaves more for spending on other things. (Interview, July 2011)

Luis and Vitoria also see that Presidente Epitácio has changed considerably since they moved abroad, or maybe they are the ones who have changed:

Everything has changed a lot, before only those who had money, the rich, could afford to buy a new car ... regular people had old cars, like for example you're in 2011, so the majority of the cars would be from 80 ... 85, so those who had a car bought between 2000 and 2011 were people who had a better standard of living, but nowadays you can't tell anymore because access to credit is so easy ... that a person with limited means ... drives a car like another person who has the means, and those who used to cycle have now left the bicycle aside and now drive a motorbike. (Interview, July 2011)

Ironically, the problem is that now, Luis and Vitoria 'don't need to leave anything hanging' but the difficulty for them is that, although they can afford to pay all their bills in cash, their 'affordability' is not valued in Brazil and paying cash, especially on big amounts, places them outside of the social context where they live their daily lives and makes them 'different': things that would be considered 'normal' in Ireland, part of the order of things, seem 'out of place' in Brazil. Mary Douglas (2002) asserts that 'dirt' is matter out of place, that is, dirt is not associated with the quality of things but rather with their location. Hence, it is not the notion of debt or credit itself that is strange, as Luis and Vitoria came to conclude, but the fact that through location, credit and debt acquire social value.

In Ireland, Luis and Vitoria have got used to something more than earning a minimum salary and living on credit but in Brazil they are reminded of the world they used to share:

There are a lot of people here who have a new car, all that stuff, new clothes, all of that, but it's all, all bought on credit ... if you buy a pair of jeans you buy it ... in 10 instalments ... to buy a pair of jeans! ... Brazil has a major fault and this is: you are what you wear, you are not the person who is speaking to me now. (Interview, July 2011)

At the end of the day it is not only a matter of 'having the means to buy' but also 'to look as a person who has the means to buy'. None of this was new to Luis and Vitoria, they had lived in Brazil all their lives, and they were well acquainted with the social norms and with what they saw as a limitation of their country and countrymen:

We knew all of this ... but we didn't know that out there [abroad] was different ... so you get used to the rhythm here, we know how things work ... it's like, we didn't realise, [because] this is our world. (Interview, July 2011)

Luis and Vitoria, like Raul and others in their situation, find it difficult to negotiate what they lived abroad with what they are now living in Brazil. Particularly difficult is reconciling how people treated them pre-migration and post-return:

People who know about our situation treat us very well, they fuss over us ... they don't know what to do with us ... before... they wouldn't even say hello ... people who perhaps had a little more than we did, they would go by and wouldn't speak to us, now they know that we came back from Ireland ... now they don't know what to do with us ... before they would ignore us and now they fuss over us and invite us for social events, that kind of stuff. (Interview, July 2011)

The solution found by Luis and Vitoria to adapt to their new circumstances and respond to these ambivalent behaviours, is however problematic for them:

We prefer to isolate ourselves ... [it's a lot of pressure] because we know all of these things and we don't want to be part of it ... so it's difficult ... why are they behaving like that just because now I have money? So, it's not about who you are, your character, it's about your purse, it's about what you wear, the car that you drive ... it's not real, and in Ireland it's not like that ... we had friends who had a better standard of living and we sat at the same table ... here a person who works cleaning houses will never sit at the same table with a person who works

in a bank ... and it's difficult ... these kind of things didn't have much weight before ... because we only knew this reality ... and then you live in a country where this kind of discrimination doesn't exist ... there is equality ... you know that it's a first world country with another culture, another vision. (Interview, July 2011)

Reordering the world upon return requires understanding where one stands but also acceptance of a certain form of reality; it is already an attempt to unify experience. When the experiences do not blend in some form or another, remaining in Brazil becomes unbearable, and return to Ireland is likely to occur. What is at stake upon return is a decision as to what must be included and what must be forgotten in order to maintain the pattern which does not render migrants as out-of-place and does not put them under the constant gaze of others. What is expected is a return to normality, integration into the order of things. Like leaving payments 'pending', this order of things is not only experiential but also temporal, as return also means to unify the experiences of temporality -- earning in one year what would otherwise take seven, and the experiences of modernity in Ireland with the experiences in Brazil. Return also requires the rescuing of common-sense experiences which enable us to 'find our bearings within our natural and social-cultural environment and to come to terms with it' (Alfred Schuetz cited in Bauman 1998: 9). Migration puts into question and brings to the fore commonsensical assumptions about how we live:

What we believe without thinking (and, above all, as long as we do not think about it) is that our experiences are typical -- that is, that whoever looks at the object 'out there' sees 'the same' as we do, and that whoever acts, follows 'the same' motives which we know from introspection. We also believe in the "interchangeability of standpoints"; to wit, if we put ourselves in another person's place, we will see and feel exactly 'the same' as he or she sees and feels in his or her present position - and that this feat of empathy may be reciprocated. (Bauman 1998: 10)

Without a common standpoint, returned migrants and non-migrants understand each other's world disorderly. In the absence of order, of the things that they thought were real, the things they thought they knew and, more importantly, the things they

thought were the only way of living, they lose their path and forget how to go on, as

Raul so clearly puts it:

Sometimes I leave the house and, to be truthful, I don't know where I'm going, I have no place to go. I wonder: what am I going to do today? It can be Sunday, it can be Monday, it's all the same. Of course I have my family ... friends that take my mind of this, but, no, it doesn't fulfil the mind, not enough for you to feel good here. (Interview, July 2011)

This is the journey of the 'melancholic who wallows in his melancholia' (Sayad 1999: 141), the 'nostalgic reaction of someone who is attached to an order that has been definitively and irremediable broken' (ibid.), and in these circumstances, as Sayad argues:

Even, or especially, the most tightly knit groups of close friends and relatives (the group made up of a spouse, children, parents, brother and sisters) are not enough to protect him from loneliness. (1999: 142)

The sense of 'disorientation' and adaptation to daily life in Brazil is also articulated by Lucas, who despite suggesting that his return to Brazil has been reasonably easy because he has gone back with 'certain guarantees' -- a job, a house, a car, he still confesses that adapting to Brazil has not been seamless after all, since so many years in Ireland 'were like another life'. Returning to Brazil meant coming back to a place which had changed and to people who have moved on:

In reality I know everyone in Presidente Epitácio ... but whilst I was away many got married, others have moved somewhere else ... so when I arrived, it takes time to get used to everything again, so much so that sometimes ... I wouldn't go out, I didn't have anyone to talk to, right? But apart from this, after sometime everything got back to normal ... I think it took about 6 months. (Interview, July 2011)

It seems that the 'gestation of uncertainty' caused by the decision by the migrant to return to Brazil, can partly be explained by the premise of post-modern men and women constantly searching for more, and who have come to realise that they cannot return to a past experience either in Brazil or in Ireland, which has come 'to be known

to us mainly through its disappearance' (Bauman 1998: 88). Their previous lives in Brazil and in Ireland have come to define their very present by their absence. Thus, what is left is a void, a kind of loss, a relationship with their present circumstances which is not simple rather it is complicated by ambivalence. I do not mean to suggest that ambivalent relationships were inexistent in the past, but they have become the central point in the migrant's life around which all other decisions are taken.

For the melancholic, Judith Butler asserts 'the social world appears to be eclipsed ... and an internal world structured in ambivalence emerges as the consequence' (1997: 167). When Luis and Vitoria suggest that Brazil was their world and that they did not know that 'somewhere out there' things were done differently, this reveals a vision of the world without ambivalence, a kind of silent acceptance, in the sense that a 'better life' was possible but realistically unachievable, which is reflected in the temporal idea that in Ireland they were able to *conquistar* (to conquer) more in one year than by working seven in Brazil. It is also revealed by, going back to the episode in 'Meu bem, Meu mal' and Doca's character, the rigid and inflexible image of the individual who is 'stuck' within the limits of one's social world. By emigrating to Ireland, and knowing the 'First World', a new variable is introduced in the relationship between migrants and their families and the wider social context in Brazil. This variable was not so much ambivalence pulling in conflicting directions but a form of ambivalence which could no longer be ignored or kept in balance because there existed a real possibility that a 'better life' was at the reach of those who emigrated. In many ways, returning to Brazil presupposes giving up this possibility, and the realisation that one is returning to the past.

Let me try to clarify this by looking at family relations. As discussed earlier, family support is probably the most central element of Brazilian culture, and social identity is fundamentally linked to family and social connections (see Korin et al. 2005).

The sense of voluntary-obligation exchange that results from such connections regulates family life and is an important part of a system of reciprocity. Freud notes that in melancholia, 'countless separate struggles are carried on over the object, in which hate and love contend with each other' (2001: 256). According to this narrative, these struggles are not between the self and the object or the ideal-loss but when the ego fails to identify the object or ideal which has been lost it turns against itself not as an object of love but as an object of aggression (Butler 1997: 197). Holly High (2011) suggests that in familial relationships, rather than love and hate, the 'key nodes are not affection and hostility but, rather, nurturance and resulting obligation, on the one hand, and the possibility (often repressed) of abandonment, on the other' (2011: 218). For Brazilian migrants, an important element in the management of ambivalence, whilst they are away, is keeping a point of equilibrium in their relationships with the close knit of the family unit, without this relationship being disrupted by a sense of abandonment.

The system of cooperation by which, as a parent, one is not only expected to support their children but also to look after one's own parents imposes cultural and moral values and plays an important role in the articulation of social order. In this regard, one of the elements of the system of cooperation is continuity. This relationship is disrupted by the possibility of abandonment through migration. However, although migrants generally spoke about feeling guilty of being away from Brazil -- most people make references to family members who have passed away and the guilt associated with not 'being there', of 'spending so many years away from them' -- this sense of guilt was often ameliorated by the fact that they were supporting financially, at least partially, their families in Brazil which often, if not always, halts upon the migrant's return. Whilst both migrants and their families speak about different degrees of abandonment, the former by abandoning, and the latter by feeling abandoned, they both reach a point of contentment and balance where the guilt of abandonment does not take over their

relationships. Although as time passes and families in Brazil start doubting if their sons and daughters, siblings and parents will ever return to Brazil, this situation is likely to change. As one parent who has a number of children living in Ireland told me once, 'we're all invisible' which indicates the loneliness people feel when the prospect of their children's return starts fading away and a sense of invisibility of the other starts to emerge, as well as a sense of loss. Upon return, in the rather commonsensical and unproblematic proposition of the Brazilian official who suggested that when in Brazil migrants are at home and therefore 'everything will be ok', migrants, and also their families, must come to terms with the void and the loss left by the absence of what Ireland stands for in their eyes, and with the ambivalence which now dominates their lives. The result of these changes are a 'multi-layered sense of loss' (Blom Hansen 2005: 298).

In discussing the loss of an object or an ideal, Freud (2001[1957]) distinguishes between mourning and melancholia. Mourning is a conscious loss, one knows what was lost, either an object or an ideal, and works through the pain and grief until the mourner accepts the loss and is then able to move on. Mourning presumes a simple relation between the mourner and the object or ideal-loss, a relationship which is complicated in melancholia by the relevance that the ego acquires. However, as Judith Butler asserts, 'the ego is a poor substitute for the lost object, and its failure to substitute in a way that satisfies (that is, to overcome its status as a substitution), leads to the ambivalence that distinguishes melancholia' (1997: 169). Melancholia then is an unconscious loss, the melancholic cannot identify what it is that has been lost, and which, as Freud notes, can seem puzzling for those around as it appears as self-tormenting. In the absence of an object or ideal-loss, the melancholic turns the grievance and the revolt against itself. Freud then suggests that the most outstanding feature of the melancholic is precisely his dissatisfaction with himself on moral grounds. A fundamental distinction between

mourning and melancholia is the incapacity of the melancholic to identify the object-loss, which renders him stuck and unable to grieve and accept the loss, since he does not know what exactly to grieve for. In that sense, in ‘mourning it is the world which has become poor and empty; in melancholia it is the ego itself’ (Freud 2001[1957]: 246). Importantly, Freud asserts that in melancholia the loss extends far beyond death but also ‘includes all those situations of being slighted, neglected or disappointed, which can import opposed feelings of love and hate into the relationship or reinforce an already existing ambivalence’ (2001[1957]: 251).

The dominant sentiment amongst returned migrants -- at least for those in the extremes of experience, that is, those who have done very well in Ireland and those who returned worse than they were before migrating, is disappointment. This feeling, is not only directed towards the external world visible in judgement comments about Brazilian life such as ‘in Brazil you are what you wear, you are not the person who is speaking to me now’ or ‘this small life that we live here’, but it is also directed at the self, through statements like ‘I blame myself’. This disappointment is also articulated in the fact that the financial success which some migrants attribute to themselves in Ireland is without reach in Brazil. In a sense the country is failing them, and they have failed the country and their families by coming back. Hence, the psychic and the social domains are produced and maintained through the links forged between them. As such, as Butler notes, ‘melancholy offers potential insight into how the boundaries of the social are instituted and maintained’ (1997: 167) and as Angela Garcia rightly notes, ‘there is meaning in melancholia’ (2010: 110) which must be seen in the light of established historical, social and cultural contexts. When migrants informally comment on their lives in Brazil by uttering sentences such as ‘in Brazil there is nothing to do’ or ‘this poverty you see here’ or even ‘we knew what Brazil was like but now we see it with different eyes’, all reflect the effects of melancholia which suggests the loss of the

social world. 'In melancholia, not only is the loss of an Other or an ideal lost to consciousness, but the social world in which such a loss became possible is also lost' (Butler 1997: 181).

The melancholic, although functioning socially, sustains a conflicting relationship with the society from where he or she has withdrawn. Whilst in Ireland, Vitoria dreamt about returning to Brazil; she and her husband, Luis, had been very successful and they were returning in very comfortable financial circumstances. But, only a few days after their arrival, Vitoria started feeling terribly ambivalent about her decision to return which escalated to a point where she felt she could not go on, 'I would wake up in the morning and I didn't want to open my eyes for fear to see that I was here' (Interview, July 2011). Her dream had become her nightmare, one she could not wake up from and could not share with anyone apart from those who felt like her, and which remained a very small circle of friends in Brazil -- all were returned migrants. So, for Vitoria and others 'you end up having Ireland as, a way of going back, a refuge', and so, 'the condition or paradox of the emigrant is that he goes on 'being present despite his absence'' (Sayad 1999: 125); hence, only being partially present, and not totally absent. Yet, the melancholic 'seeks not only to reverse time, reinstating the imaginary past as the present, but to occupy every position' (Butler 1997: 182); the melancholic like Raul and Vitoria and others in their situation who do not know how to go on, refuse to let go of a time that is already gone and live in a state of permanent in-betweenness.

To end this in-betweenness, Freud says that the only possible way is through the acceptance of 'a verdict of reality' (2001[1957]: 255), a coming to terms with what has to be accepted and what must be denied for the person to live on. For the melancholic, Judith Butler notes, 'breaking the attachment constitutes a second loss of the object' (1997: 192) which in the case of the migrant poses a predicament as to either remain in Brazil and accept and grieve the loss of the ideal, the possibility of a different life, and,

as Alice suggested 'keep pressing on to at least survive' which 'inaugurates one's own emergence' (Butler 1997: 195); or return to Ireland in an attempt to recover and mend an ideal lost; or even remain in Brazil in a permanent state of melancholia.

The question, however, is that, all along, the ideal-loss of what Ireland represented was never something that could be lost because it never existed, at least not in a permanent state. The ideal existed momentarily during those weeks when the migrant returned to Brazil on holidays when the two realities, Ireland and Brazil, collided and the shield was up. Although the ideal as such was never real, return to Brazil makes that knowledge conscious and once the possibility of a different life is accepted as an unlikely possibility, the loss of the ideal triggers another kind of loss, the loss of desire.

Against Freud, Slavoj Žižek (2000) argues that in melancholia what is lost is not an object or an ideal but rather the desire for the object or ideal, in other words what it is lost is the desire, not the object. He suggests that the problem with the notion of melancholia that Freud proposes is 'the status of anamorphosis' (2000: 659) which concerns an object or ideal:

Whose very material reality is distorted in such a way that a gaze is inscribed into its objective feature ... In other words, anamorphosis undermines the distinction between objective reality and its distorted subjective perception; in it, the subjective distortion is reflected back into the perceived object itself, and, in this precise sense, the gaze itself acquires a supposedly objective existence. (ibid.)

Furthermore, Žižek asserts that it is this very distinction between objective reality and its distorted subjective perception which disappears in melancholia. This notion is important insofar as the image that Brazilian migrants have of Ireland -- and the image that non-migrants have of it, is an image which ignores this distinction between objective reality and subjective perception. The objective image of Ireland is transformed into a place which enables a number of actions in Brazil, it is not of its own, it is only real when seen in opposition to Brazil; in other words, whereas Brazil is, as migrants put it 'the reality', Ireland is only an enabler of reality in Brazil and

therefore is not a real ideal on its own. As stated earlier, the 'shield' which migrants have when they are on holidays protects them from the reality of Brazil, but nonetheless, it is a reality which they know. On the other end, Ireland does not have those properties: life in Ireland is rather an enabler of this possibility of life which is lived for a short time on holidays. Even the levels of consumption in Ireland are measured and compared to Brazil, as they do not have a direct connection to Ireland as such. For example, Brazilian migrants do not speak about considering buying a house in Ireland and the reasons for this are not only financial. The fact is that buying a house in Ireland is slightly nonsensical since it does not feed into the Brazilian reality, it has no transferability. In that sense, thinking of melancholia in terms of the loss of an object or ideal-loss obfuscates the fact that the ideal was never possible in the first place. What was possible was to desire that ideal which materialised during holidays in Brazil, and the possibility of thinking of oneself as a different person, free from social constraints and financial hardship. What this presupposes then is that a sense of freedom is only experienced in these moments when this ideal was momentarily possible but which is experienced as loss, a void, when the migrant experiences Ireland without Brazil, or Brazil without Ireland. As migrants have repeated numerous times, regardless of where they are, 'there is something missing' but where, at the same time, they feel equally connected to. As such, 'melancholy is not simply the attachment to the lost object but the attachment to the very original gesture of its loss' (Žižek 2000: 660). Melancholy of Ireland is not the loss of the attachment to a place, or even to a lifestyle but it is rather a loss of a possibility. This loss of the object was not in reality possible because the object itself had never existed. The possibility, the potentialities for wealth and consumption and money were real only when invested in Brazil. In Ireland migrants do not generally speak about wealth creating without referring to the transposition of this wealth to Brazil; and upon return to Brazil the wealth created is never dissociated from Ireland.

One cannot exist without the other: they are mutually and forever intertwined, they coexist. Upon return, these possibilities vanish and are lacking, leaving a void. The dream of living in Ireland, the 'First World', as it is so often described, only makes sense in opposition to Brazil. Furthermore, the dream only makes sense when these two realities are interlinked. Upon return the lack of this possibility is used to actualise the loss of this link.

Once the ideal, a reproduction of the feelings of protection and safety during holidays, is recognised as an impossibility in the everyday upon the migrant's return, this realisation triggers another kind of loss, the loss of the desire to reproduce indefinitely that holiday feeling precisely because the migrant has realised that the feeling is only possible for that short period of time. If we consider 'return' as the desired object or ideal or aim, melancholia occurs when migrants finally achieve the coveted objective -- with all the financial security that they worked so hard for, but are disappointed with it. None of the material things nor any of the emotional attachments to Brazil can satisfy their desire. In Ireland, migrants saw the sharing of accommodation as necessary conditions to ensure a stable and 'ready' return which presupposed economic freedom, emotional support and social familiarity to Brazil, but the dream of a stable and 'ready' return never really came, at least not in the short or medium-term.

For those who can return to Ireland, even after an extended period in Brazil which had meant to be permanent return, Ireland becomes the desired object but the desire for it has changed since Ireland is now increasingly detached from the aims which it served in Brazil. For this reason, the symbiotic relationship between Ireland and Brazil as both parts of one single desired object which has ceased to exist must, perhaps, now be filled with some other object. The migrant is increasingly freer from one part of the relationship and becomes increasingly a prisoner of the other. But it is precisely through the experience of melancholia and a state of permanent in-betweenness that return

migrants live a moral life, a life that as Garcia so eloquently states is ‘a locally and interpersonally engaged life’ (110).

CHAPTER 5

The unintended cosmopolitan

In previous chapters I have aimed to examine migration through the everyday relations that migrants maintain with others and with themselves, and I have attempted to contextualise these relations on the basis of the moral obligations that migrants sustain and forge with their kin in Brazil and in Ireland. Whilst the introduction of a wider availability of money, which eventually leads to a sense of individual freedom and independence, allows migrants to contemplate the possibility of living a life in Ireland without the constraints imposed by a small salary and a life where one works ‘during the day so you can eat in the evening’ (Interview, March 2011), the wider availability of money proper also introduces new complexities to the moral obligations that migrants and non-migrants have to each other. As I have suggested earlier, money itself may enable a degree of individual freedom in economic terms, but most of all it offers access to a world of consumption where nearly anything can be bought and sold. This level of consumption experienced in Ireland allows for a new kind of life to be considered but this possibility comes at the expense of an increased distance between migrants and their kin in Brazil.

As migrants consider these changes and reflect on their experiences of life in Brazil and life in Ireland, they articulate their thoughts as a tension between two wills pulling in different directions, between the individual freedom that Ireland affords them through a wider availability of money and consumption, and the moral imperatives and commitments which sustain their relationships to their kin in Brazil and ultimately enables the migrant’s return to Brazil. As kinship is reworked organically, non-migrants and migrants adapt and readapt to the different social environments, and reciprocity is worked out broadly within the gaps between the dictums of a new moral compass and the interests of the parties. This seems contradictory since I have earlier suggested that the basis of moral commitments remains the same, which I maintain, but the extension of those commitments expands not because the commitment itself has changed but

because the resources that make the commitment workable have. The uncertainty created by the tension of these two 'wills' is none other than the realisation that 'we can't have it all', it is at the same time an individual 'emancipatory project' as Nigel Rapport (2007) has suggested, and the realisation that emancipation comes at the expense of 'the small things' only possible in Brazil, the things that bind migrants to their kin and which bring comfort to daily life:

In Brazil, there are simple things, you go to the river - it's very hot, you go to a bar and play a game of pool with your friends, you invite your friends for a barbecue at home, you go to your relatives' houses to a barbecue, simple things that you don't really have here. (Interview, December 2010)

Ultimately, this 'tension of wills' permeates life in Ireland and in Brazil, and influences migration, return, possible re-migration and, perhaps more realistically, a life lived here and there. Therefore, it seems futile to think migration as a unilateral action, as a sequence of departure and arrival, since every departure is also an arrival, and every arrival always presupposes a departure. For these reasons, I have also argued that the study of migration should concern itself not only with the interests of sending or receiving countries, but rather the process of migration must be discussed within a broader perspective to include emigration, immigration, return migration and the possibility of neither of these 'sedentarist' dimensions, allowing for the possibility that migrants may decide to live here and there without necessarily 'rooting' themselves anywhere. But I must exercise caution here: this does not mean that migrants consider themselves as 'uprooted', as people not belonging to anywhere, but it does mean that their experience of the world is articulated in different terms.

Abdelmalek Sayad avers that the immigrant is 'atopos', displaced and uprooted, 'trapped in that 'mongrel' sector of social space betwixt and between social being and nonbeing' and notes that the migrant 'exists only by default in the sending community and by excess in the receiving society' (Bourdieu and Wacquant 2000: 178). I partly

agree with him, but I would also suggest that the migrant is transcendent, and it is within this quality of being an individual that he may find a place in the world, a place which is cosmopolitan, where he could live on his own terms even if these terms are in constant tension and are not always coherent. This tension illustrates a moment of 'slow and painful metamorphosis' (ibid.) but it is nonetheless a metamorphosis and hence, in some ways, is an obvious moment of possibility, an opportunity to live on one's own terms or to reject that. Nevertheless, I think that the outcome of this metamorphosis, allowing for the possibility that this moment of change may never be completed, is as much personal as it is social, and it is as much cosmopolitan as it is communitarian.

This chapter argues that whilst migrants display cosmopolitanism through the experience of migration they also remain deeply committed to traditional kinship expectations and patterns of reciprocity. This tension is not necessarily negative or positive but becomes a way of life, combining a not always easy to resolve obligation to kinship networks in Brazil and the desire to remain 'modern' by virtue of travel and 'having seen and lived in the First World' which seems to be possible only in Ireland. The limitations created by the tension of the two, imprint a sense of uncertainty and doubt in everyday life. However, finding a balance between expressing a cosmopolitan character and remaining loyal to the local is not only possible but essential to the mediation between 'who one used to be' and 'who one has become', between the desire to remain attached to social ties and the desire for transcendence. In that sense, what seems crucial here is not the determination of what constitutes the cosmopolitan or the communitarian per se, but the examination into the ways through which migrants relate to the world and make decisions based on the experience of difference which they have come into contact in Ireland through an alternative mode of modernity, with the result that these decisions are simultaneously local and cosmopolitan. What is very obvious to me is that when confronted with a new reality, individuals find ways to live-on, to build

a new place in the world in circumstances when this new place does not correspond to the expectations of happiness that they had anticipated or predicted. Living-on presumes the inclusion of new patterns of being in the world which influence the ways migrants make decisions and choose to live in a world which now feels bigger and richer, but less familiar.

Therefore, the experience of migration and the experience of difference become a central element in the lives of migrants. But how might one define that experience? Especially when, as I would argue, that experience is both individual and social? Also, as I have noted above, experience does not exist in a time-vacuum, and the evaluation of migrants' experiences in Ireland reflect not only the moment-to-moment of past, present and future but reflect an evaluation of what could have been possible and what is, in fact, the reality. Moreover, what are the properties of the experience of modernity in Ireland?

Jason Throop notes that one of the difficulties in defining structures of experience is the fact that experience itself 'encompasses the indeterminate, the fluid, the incoherent, the internal, the disjuncture, the fragmentary, the coherent, the intersubjective, the determinate, the rigid, the external, the cohesive, the conjunctive and the unitary' (2003: 227). In this, moments of determinate and coherent conjunction as much as moments of disjuncture where the world is experienced as fluid and incoherent, are all composite of structures of experience. Throop makes a distinction between 'retrospective 'ends'' which structure the past, and 'projected 'ends'' which, because they happen in the present in relation to the future, do not necessarily have a fixed and cohesive quality. As Throop notes, it is in moments of uncertainty that we fail to find coherence and, 'during these moments there may be perceived breaks and disjunctions in our experience of lived temporality' (2003: 234). Throop (2003: 233ff) proposes a 'complemental model of experience' based on the 'organization of attention'

which looks at past and future whilst allowing for moments of inbetweenness, which are neither fully coherent nor disjunctive, to occur. Throop concludes by stating that whilst experience can be articulated in these moments, it cannot however coexist and must be organised in temporal succession. But moments of full conjuncture and moments of total disjuncture are likely to be rare. And, as such, I think it might be more productive to think of these moments as never fully coherent nor fully disjunctive, but, rather, as moments where experience is articulated within the confines of uncertainty and ambivalence, albeit to different degrees of clarity. In the light of this, I do not believe that completeness ever materializes; rather, I think it is more likely that migrants work through the disjunctures that migration introduces which give rise to new forms of commitment and create new ways to belong.

Migration studies tend to analyse collective sets of experiences representing people moving from one place to another, but this analysis often forgets that the migratory experience is, although included and impossible to dissociate from this social movement, also deeply personal and individual. As explored above, migration changes the relationships that migrants have with money and credit, it introduces new patterns of consumption and paths of experience of an alternative modernity. However, it is undeniable that migration also changes the relationship that the migrant has with him or herself. Hence, migrating is both transcendent and social, biographical and historical.

Malkki (1992) argues that it is the sedentarism in our thinking which compels us to see ourselves as rooted in one particular place, a place which becomes impoverished when someone leaves or when someone who does not belong settles in. This ‘sedentary’ thinking permeates the social sciences and migration policy, as I have shown, and comes to give life to the idea that anywhere that is not my country must be someone else’s, reinforcing the thought that one must belong to one place and one place alone. Such understandings, as Malkki (1992) asserts, come to frame our thinking about

territory and identity, with the consequence that the ties stitching people to the territory and to the nation are not only territorialising but also ‘deeply metaphysical’. As discussed earlier, the nation and its people are seen to sustain a symbiotic relation, in which change threatens the stability of not only the person itself and their own sense of identity and place, but also threatens the stability and the continuity of the nation and its integrity. As such, people and culture are tied to national soil and blood, and the world becomes a set of ‘mutually exclusive units’ in need of regulation. As Malkki insightfully observes this relationship is ‘deeply metaphysical and deeply moral’ (1992: 31) and permeates social and political practice. Moreover, the concept of rootedness leads us to separate people between those who belong to the nation, and those who we must remain vigilant about. This distinction and its subsequent implications is clearly set in the principles of Irish immigration policy, as highlighted by the remark of the then minister for justice and law reform, Deputy Dermot Ahern, on 6 October 2010, during a Dáil Éireann debate:

It is a fundamental principle of our immigration law that a foreign national has no right, as such, to enter or be in Ireland. There is considerable jurisprudential authority which makes clear that the State has not only the power — a power exercised mainly by the Minister for Justice and Law Reform — to manage the entry into, presence in and removal from the State of non-nationals, but also has a duty to do so in protection of the interests of Irish society and the integrity of the State’s immigration processes. (www.oireachtasdebates.oireachtas.ie)

To this, Mr. Ahern added:

The Supreme Court has continuously affirmed and adopted the well-known passage outlining the role of the State in the control of foreign nationals as described by Mr. Justice Gannon in *Osheku v. Ireland*, where he stated: [T]hat it is in the interests of the common good of a State that it should have control of the entry of aliens, their departure and their activities and duration of stay within the State is and has been recognised universally and from earliest times. There are fundamental rights of the State itself as well as fundamental rights of the individual citizen, and the protection of the former may involve restrictions in circumstances of necessity on the latter. The integrity of the State constituted as it is for the collective body of its citizens within the national territory must be defended and vindicated by the organs of the State and by the citizens so that there may be true social order within the territory and concord maintained with other

nations in accordance with the objectives declared in the preamble to the Constitution. (www.oireachtasdebates.oireachtas.ie)

In these terms, the notion of rootedness introduces the concept of the foreigner (see Kristeva 1991), of the one who does not belong. The concept of rootedness and, as a consequence, the concept of the foreigner stems from, as Julia Kristeva (1991) suggests, the privileging of the 'rights of the citizen' over the 'rights of men', as the foreigner takes formal shape in the establishment of nation-states and in a preoccupation in defending the rights of the country's citizens, defined by their relationships of blood and/or soil. It is in this context that the foreigner is then identified and accepted as belonging or not to a particular nation-state. As Kristeva (1991: 96) argues, even if the foreigner concentrates on himself the 'fascination and the repulsion' attributed to otherness, his foreignness is thought of in social and political terms, and his and her inclusion or exclusion is always dependent on the rights awarded to him or her by a social group structured around a particular political power. Here, the foreigner is identified, and is accepted or rejected through the attribution of given legal rights. The foreigner becomes and remains the foreigner precisely through the acceptance or rejection of his or her human condition, and thus his or her condition of foreignness can be modified but never neutralised. The foreigner construes his or her life in the inbetweenness of being a part of humanity, consciously a citizen of the world, but whose capacities are always limited by the rights of the citizen and the determinations of nation-states. In this sense, as Kristeva eloquently states, 'we have all deeply interiorized to the point of considering it normal that there are foreigners, that is, people who do not have the same rights as we do' (1991: 103) which deeply undermines our relationship with others, and makes us search and pursue social uniformity. It is within the national group wrapped around principles which determine that foreigners have 'no right, as such, to enter or be in Ireland' that the citizen is constituted as free and equal of

right. Thus, as Kristeva argues, the ‘free and equal man is, de facto, the citizen’ (1991: 149). So the question is: if Man is the citizen and hence social, is his or her humanity a secondary phenomenon? How does one continue to exercise his or her rights as Man, when these are fundamentally linked to his or her rights as citizen? When migration policies do not let us forget that, as Nigel Rapport notes, ‘the condition of being born and bred in a particular locale does not address the potentiality of human expression and the universalities of human capacity which Anyone, the individual human being, has a global right to pursue’ (2010: 470), how does one find a place in this newly found inbetweenness? Jacques Derrida suggests that from a political and philosophical stance, the question remains as to:

Knowing if the improvement is possible within a historical space which takes place between the Law of an unconditional hospitality, offered *a priori* to every other, to all newcomers, whoever they may be, and the conditional laws of a right to hospitality, without which The unconditional Law of hospitality would be in danger of remaining a pious and irresponsible desire, without form and without potency, and of even being perverted at any moment. (2001: 22-23)

In this case, is cosmopolitanism only possible in the absence of borders and nation-states? I would suggest that cosmopolitanism, in political terms, is possible only in the presence of nation-states otherwise it would be senseless to talk about a ‘cosmos’, the universal condition, and ‘polis’ as the local. The need for a cosmopolitan analysis arises precisely in the context of the ‘sedentarist thinking’ which Malkki (1992) discusses, and as reaction to Herder’s claim that ‘there was no such thing to know, only Germans and French, and so on, humans ensconced in communities of blood and soil’ (Herder cited in Rapport 2007: 268). What I have tried to show is that the ‘complete trajectories’ of Brazilian migrants tell us that migration can be an emancipatory trajectory, and that one can become a part of different communities and of more than one nation. Furthermore, it is this project that I consider to be a cosmopolitan one. The question is then how to apprehend the many ways in which individual emancipation is

negotiated and expressed upon return. In order to do that we must first inquire into the stranger, the other; in other words, do we need the foreigner to be able to talk about the stranger? And, is the stranger always a foreigner?

Circumstances generate the encounter with the stranger, and the recognition of strangeness and the degree to which this interaction may or may not shape our world-views is dependent on a conversation which is had internally and is transcendent. But this conversation cannot happen entirely outside of culture or of understanding of country and nation. The stranger emerges within the self and through this, the migrant questions his or her ways of interacting in a familiar world and incorporates, in many ways as a matter of survival, the otherness encountered on the everyday. For migrants, their relationship with migration is one of ambivalence in the face of strangeness, since migrants imagine themselves seamlessly returning to the familiar and the known in Brazil by clawing to promises of ‘everything will be the same’, knowing however that change is inescapable and that their experiences of the ‘First World’ have changed them. For the vast majority of the migrants who are still in Ireland, return to Brazil represents the return to the known, a step away from the strangeness and otherness that Ireland represents, however, this is not always the case. Adapting to Brazil requires time to unpack the processes which were once familiar, and accept the fact that once one leaves, one is never fully back. As Kristeva avers:

Strange indeed is the encounter with the other - whom we perceive by means of sight, hearing, smell, but do not “frame” within our consciousness. The other leaves us separate, incoherent; even more so, he can make us feel that we are not in touch with our own feelings. (1991: 187)

For this reason, the experience of migration cannot be articulated in fully coherent terms, precisely because of the encounter with the stranger and an otherness which informs future choices. I found myself writing and wondering if I am writing about life in Ireland or return to Brazil, and discover that the experience of strangeness is

borderless, that the encounter with strangeness changes the familiar regardless of place, that engagement with strangeness destroys the boundaries around which the internal and the social worlds are built against. As Kristeva notes:

I lose my composure. I feel “lost”, “indistinct”, “hazy”. The uncanny strangeness allows for many variations: they all repeat the difficulty I have in situating myself with respect to the other and keep going over the course of identification - projection that lies at the foundation of my reaching autonomy. (1991: 187)

This conflict, then, does not happen only with the stranger within but accounts for external otherness. Strangeness is important here because although that very notion, which Lucas condenses in the statement ‘living in Ireland is like living in my neighbour’s house’ (Interview, November 2005), it is also a concept that has changed and evolved for Brazilian migrants. In fact, migrants come to see themselves as belonging to neither Ireland nor Brazil, but rather as belonging to both. As discussed earlier, it is the fact that migrants feel that they have to choose between one place or the other which creates feelings of melancholia and loss. However, the question here is not to evaluate belonging or to determine who belongs to where, or even to make a case for the measurement of integration but rather to show that group membership is not intrinsic to human identity and therefore the very concept of measuring a kind of exclusive and a-temporal belonging is senseless. As Nigel Rapport (2012: 175) argues, individuals are capable of stepping outside the group and pursue their own life-projects, which might just involve the rejection and refusal to comply with group identity. Migrants’ everyday experiences show us precisely that, that beyond group membership there exists the possibility of not belonging exclusively to here or there, but rather everyday life can be lived in the ‘inbetweenness’ of Ireland and Brazil; in some ways they are strangers and familiar to both. This ‘inbetweenness’ is not spatial, rather it contains the emotional and temporal tensions between social and familial commitments

to kinship in Brazil -- a relationship filled with obligations and solidarity, and the individual freedom acquired in Ireland.

Lisette Josephides notes that Freud's discovery of a certain kind of strangeness within ourselves has paved the way to our explorations of cosmopolitanism and, importantly, has given us the 'courage to recognize ourselves as 'disintegrated' beings who, rather than integrate foreigners or hunt them down, should welcome them to that 'uncanny strangeness' in which we all live' (2014: 3); this courage extends as much to the external other as to the internal other. The kind of cosmopolitanism I would like to discuss here is one which is present in the 'inbetweeness' that separates the other from the self, and the self from a part of itself which was unknown until the experience of migration provided the conditions for it to be recognised; as such, this experience was unintended and unplanned but has nevertheless come to imprint migrants' lives in all its force and indeterminacy. Lisette Josephides (2010) argues that cosmopolitanism as the existential condition considers human beings as both transcendent and social, and notes that although, as Kristeva asserts, the 'foreigner is within me, hence we are all foreigners' (1991: 192) and in that way the 'uncanny strangeness' is an invitation to discover the otherness in ourselves, these insights do not offer a convincing response to the enquire into 'how to know others in alterity -- that is, radical difference' (Josephides 2010: 391). As such, an understanding of the 'foreigner within oneself' does not fully address the relations of exteriority nor the feelings of freedom inspired by the encounter with the 'absolutely other'. In that sense, my experiences are personal insofar as they are the result of a discovery of that otherness in me, and they are also social insofar as that discovery was brought about by the interaction with the other 'through respect, an ethical relationship' (Josephides 2010: 392), and as such it requires the recognition of a shared humanity.

A number of scholars have approached cosmopolitanism as a moral and existential condition noting that empathy is connected to morality and compassion. Mark Schiltz (2014) explores cosmopolitanism through the theme of imperilling the self by reaching out to others. By approaching cosmopolitanism as a ‘human capacity for empathy and sociality’ (110), a project of self-discovery and through which we welcome the other, Schiltz argues that in the case of the missionary Borghero and his encounter with king Glele, the meeting between the two men signalled hospitality and goodwill. Moreover, the encounter between the two was animated by a personal desire to know the Other, a desire which requires that both men take risks as ‘hospitality assumes mutual trust’ (116). In the process of placing our trust in others, one finds himself or herself travelling into unknown territory where one cannot predict the impact that the encounter with the other might have on their own lives and future. This is a relationship that, as Schiltz observes, crystallises the fact that at the same time that we welcome the other we also imperil ourselves. Therefore, cosmopolitanism, understood in this way, translates into an ‘ethical impulse’, striving for shared humanity between individuals, an act which is never risk free because it requires that individuals move beyond their cultural horizons.

Alexandra Hall (2014) in her moving account and analysis of the suicide of one of the detainees at the Locksdon Immigration Removal Centre in the United Kingdom, shows how the incident reveals that cosmopolitan morality may emerge out of moments of shared vulnerability which in her analysis was exemplified by the transformative relationship that grew between one of the detainees and one of the officers after the incident had taken place. In an environment where ‘unknown-ness must be carefully managed’ (75), the two men find common ground, which transforms their future relationship. A similar point is also made by Anne Sigfrid Grønseth (2014). Her ethnography shows that cosmopolitanism, as an ethical horizon where individuals

recognise each other as human beings, as sharing a common humanity, also requires conditions in which to develop. The two case studies that Grønseth discusses show how the personal experiences of Tamil refugees and local Norwegians can help to bridge empathy that extends beyond the distance created by the 'us' and 'them'; it was the moment when Vesantha, one of Grønseth's informants, exchanged glances and a laugh with the staff at her children's kindergarten that cemented the ground for her to feel a sense of joy and togetherness. What both Hall and Grønseth's ethnographies show is that it was in these moments of vulnerability and recognition of a common humanity that distinctions and hierarchies lose their fixity and become bridges for mutual understanding and empathy. What the above studies also show is that personal and moral repositioning is needed for a true cosmopolitan vision of the world to flourish. Eriksen (2014), however, is not too sure of how this vision actually pans out, because for him cosmopolitanism is not to be necessarily found in dialogue and cognitive understanding. Rather, cosmopolitanism is found in moments of cooperation and interaction in the everyday. The author points to the difficulties of living along others who are different from 'us' but notes that this difficulty is not contra cosmopolitanism, because cosmopolitanism can coexist with difference. And, whilst we recognise cultural boundaries and maneuver ourselves within those boundaries, as we go about in our daily lives, we also recognise a common humanity and act on it.

The management between the self and the other is important for Brazilian migrants upon their return to Presidente Epitácio, because what is at stake is the negotiation of difference in a subtle and everyday manner which, in my view, speaks of the possibility of cosmopolitanism. Josephides poses a question which, I feel, is fundamental for migrants upon their return to Brazil: how can otherness found in oneself, and otherness found in the external other, 'keep us both individual and social?' (2010: 389)

Migration catapults migrants and their families, relatives and friends into different life paths, where the stranger is likely to emerge. The experience of the stranger creates a distance between people and country, and introduces new practices and values. These practices and values are not necessarily a rejection of previous arrangements but nevertheless require incorporation into the everyday and the local. Through an examination of family and kinship dynamics, the migrant must find ways to welcome the other and negotiate the otherness encountered within himself or herself by, as discussed in previous chapters, discovering and recognising a ‘I can do it’ attitude. Moreover, he or she must also negotiate the absolute otherness initially encountered in an alternative form of modernity experienced in Ireland and a familiar otherness encountered upon their return to Brazil.

Nigel Rapport argues that at present, agreement on the precise meaning of cosmopolitanism is inexistent (2012). For him, however, cosmopolitanism is primarily an outcome of western thought (cf. Graeber 2008) and, for Rapport, Kant’s writing represents the clearest formulation of a contemporary vision. Thus he departs from the notion of cosmopolitanism exposed by Kant where the cosmopolitan is the citizen ‘of two worlds: polis and cosmos, local community and a “worldwide community of humankind”’ (Rapport 2006: 23). In the light of this, a cosmopolitan perspective should be:

Best understood as a philosophy of freedom: part of a liberal, emancipatory tradition that would accord the individual universal recognition and universal rights *vis-à-vis* the social, cultural, national, communitarian, structures, categories and classes in which he or she happens to find himself or herself by the accident of birth or of later circumstances. (Rapport 2010: 464)

Cosmopolitanism is then, fundamentally, a form of human expression where individuals are free to take charge of composing and living their own life-plan without the restrictions of the ‘politics of identity’; it is an ‘emancipatory project’. But this possibility of a cosmopolitan order, Rapport suggests, derives from Kant’s belief in the

human capacity for reason as the most independent human faculty. This fundamentally means that a key point in cosmopolitan identity, for Rapport, is the fact that the individual should be free to determine his or her own allegiances, and he goes as far as to suggest that:

Adherence to culture, a set of behavioural forms and sanctions, need not be a life sentence. Rather, membership of a cultural community, a religious congregation, and ethnic group or a local set should be a choice of lifestyle. (2012: 55)

Therefore the individual achieves his or her full potential once they have developed and are able to manifest an individual consciousness beyond cultural and social determinations. For Rapport, cosmopolitanism promises ‘a freedom for the individual from imprisonment in culture and community, in country and church, in class and category’ (2012: 75) and envisages a future where the individual human actor is unshackled from the ties that link him or her to social, cultural and historical constraints, and liberates him or her to develop his or her own person beyond culture and the space of community. As such, the individual, for Rapport, has a nature which is distinct from those categories. Thus, for Rapport, the cosmopolitan either ‘is’ or ‘is not’; cosmopolitanism is not a description, as it seems to be for Hall, Grønseth, Josephides or Schiltz but is instead a way of being and participating in the world.

The problem with this vision is that by thinking about culture as a ‘cosy’ reality, not necessarily as life but as only a way through which we express our lives, I think we risk subjugating culture to a secondary plane and, as Vered Amit has already observed, we fall into the tricky situation that we start assuming a hierarchy between individual endeavour and that undertaken at the collective and societal level (Amit and Rapport 2012: 18-19). Thus, I think that it might serve us better to reflect on cosmopolitanism as a space of mediation -- of ‘inbetweenness’, where the desire for emancipation meets the desire for remaining attached to the local without relegating the self to a secondary

position. In that sense, and despite the apparent contradiction, cosmopolitanism does not imply rootlessness.

Kwame Anthony Appiah argues that the cosmopolitan can be rooted, exercising his or her loyalties to several localities without abandoning their loyalties and moral ties to their families and communities, and indeed these emotional links that sustain social lives are of paramount significance because they ‘endow us with the full richness of resources available for self-creation’ (1997: 625). For Appiah, as opposed to Rapport, the freedom to create oneself ‘requires of socially transmitted options from which to invent what we have come to call our identities’ (ibid.); they provide ‘the tool kit of self-creation’ and therefore they are not a hindrance but are in fact facilitators that provide us with an understanding of the expectations and the obligations that links us to families, friends, communities, neighbourhoods, and indeed strangers, and provide us with the language in which to think about our own identities. For Appiah, a version of cosmopolitanism that focuses on the existential condition is problematic because it suggests that ‘there is only creativity, that there is nothing for us to respond to, nothing out of which to construct’ (2001: 323-324). In that sense, the rooted cosmopolitan is not only individual but his or her individuality always presupposes sociability since our responses to the situations we are confronted with on a daily basis are shaped not only by rational and internal reason alone but also by sentiment and by the relationships that are not only within us but also outside us in the social world (see also Hodgson 2008; Abu-Rabia 2008). Therefore, Appiah observes:

Each person you know about and can affect is someone to whom you have responsibilities, even if they are largely negative ones. To say that is to affirm the very idea of morality (2007: 2378).

In that sense, at the heart of cosmopolitanism is respect for culture, ‘not because cultures matter in themselves, but because people matter and culture matters to people (2007: 2379). In that sense, for Appiah there are two visions which come together in the

concept of cosmopolitanism: one is the fact that we have obligations to others, the familiar other and the strange other; and secondly we value human life as an absolute and also as forms of particular human lives. Therefore, we should take an interest in the ‘practices and beliefs that lend them significance’ (2006: xiii).

Pnina Werbner explores many of the apparent contradictions of rooted cosmopolitanism and extends them to the study of transnationalism. In developing the concept of vernacular cosmopolitanism, Werbner notes that cosmopolitans may feel morally and sentimentally attached to several places but ‘much depends on context’ (2011: 113). In that sense being a transnational migrant does not make a cosmopolitan, and likewise a cosmopolitan does not necessarily have to be well travelled. The key point is to understand the bridges that migrants build with the Other and the extent to which they become versed in the tradition of others. It must be noted that for Werbner cosmopolitanism is not the prerogative of the elites (Hannerz 1990), as is argued by others in relation to working class transnationalism (Tsuda 2003); but equally, not all migrants are cosmopolitans. In fact, Werbner is emphatic in this distinction. Rather than painting all transnationals with the same brush which inevitably leads to a version of migrants as homogenous beings, Werbner points out that although working class labour migrants may become cosmopolitans whose qualities are reflected in a willingness to open up to the Other, it might also be the case that migrants will engage in social processes but this engagement is always ‘relatively circumscribed culturally’ (1999: 18). In that sense, transnationals build relatively insular worlds around them; but some transnationals may also become cosmopolitans by virtue of familiarising themselves with other cultures and by being able to navigate them at ease (1999: 23).

Cosmopolitanism then is not only accessible to intellectuals and tourists, to part of an elite who travels the world. For Werbner’s informants (1999), cosmopolitanism is, rather than being a mode of individual exploration and experience, a collective and

highly selective perspective, a blended set of moral and cultural assumptions and sensibilities that transcend national borders. One of her key messages is that ‘we need to recognise that cosmopolitanism is as much an openness to prior strangers next door, a willingness to forge new weak but significant ties, as it is a commitment to sustain prior strong global links’ (1999: 33). Importantly, Werbner argues that processes of transnationalism and localisation are historically and culturally specific. Indeed, global networks may disrupt notions of commitment to people and places, but this does not deny the validity of local attachments and obligations. Thus, cosmopolitanism ‘does not necessarily imply an absence of belonging but the possibility of belonging to more than one ethnic and cultural localism simultaneously’ (1999: 34).

Since cosmopolitanism is always ‘situated’ (Werbner 2008), it is important to position the experiences of cosmopolitanism expressed in daily life by Brazilian migrants, and focus on the relationships which are worked out in quotidian practices upon return. Vered Amit observes that whilst studies of community tend to address the common ground between people, there are areas which inevitably overlap, and it is in these areas that we can ‘work and rework a variety of combinations and distinctions as we examine different cases’ (Amit and Rapport 2012: 5). The experiences and circumstances of migration lived by Alice, Luis and Vitoria, Lucas, and Raul are all very different and individual situations, and each of them has responded to what migration has offered them in very personal terms. This experience is deeply cosmopolitan since their time abroad opened the possibility of individual freedom, albeit fuelled by the introduction of a wider availability of money and forms of consumption. But, I also believe that the contact and the acknowledgment of difference in Ireland and in Brazil is also a ‘communitarian’ and social experience insofar as migrants and non-migrants take account of the strange and the familiar which, in itself, expands the boundaries of community and kinship. In that sense, I am inclined to

disagree with Rapport when he proposes that ‘communitarianism is a threat to human freedoms’ (Amit and Rapport 2012: 138) because for Brazilian migrants freedom seems to be found within the balance achieved between obligations to kin and obligations to oneself.

As discussed earlier, migration was never, at least for the vast majority of Brazilian migrants, a life choice, in fact when Irish companies started recruiting Brazilians in Presidente Epitácio, many migrants rejected job offers in Ireland. The decision to travel and work in Ireland was, nearly always, associated with a speedier access to money and with the thought of returning to Brazil and of ‘returning to life’ as they knew it before emigrating to Ireland. Therefore, the decision and the ambition to emigrate to Ireland was never a quest for the experience of difference; rather, the acknowledgment and appropriation of difference came as an unwarranted consequence. Migrants, to different degrees of involvement, became *unintended cosmopolitans*, since their initial orientation was not to engage with the Other, as such, as Ulf Hannerz (1990: 239) would suggest of the ‘genuine cosmopolitan’, but to fulfil normative expectations such as to ‘buy a house’ and ‘help the family’. In these circumstances, can we, as Ulrich Beck (2002) remarks, talk about cosmopolitanism or should we be discussing several cosmopolitanisms? Beck suggests that the ‘emerging significance of cosmopolitanism is about a plurality of antagonisms and differences’ (2002: 35), and, as such, we should perhaps stray away from the social tension between the cosmopolitan and the local, and enquire as to how we might include alternative forms of modernity in our analysis, ‘how to include the otherness of the future’ (Ibid.: 19). If, as Ronald Stede asserts ‘the past is a universe of countless perspectives. Why should the future be any different?’ (2007: 232), and if ‘the conceptual history of cosmopolitanism is full of contested meanings and interpretations’ (ibid.: 233) should we not be thinking of the present and the future as consisting of ruptures and disjunctions framed by the willingness and hopefulness

that we can both remain attached to the local without letting go of our universal human condition, by also considering those alternative forms of modernity that have come to frame the migrants' experiences of return migration?

Cláudia Fonseca (2000) in her insightful study of family and neighbourhood relations in Vila do Cachorro and Vila São João -- two neighbourhoods in the city of Porto Alegre, during the 1980s and 1990s, observes that acquisition power opens a gap between those who gain access to material and symbolic goods and those who 'are left behind'. This gap, however, does not represent a rupture in kinship ties which are not easily broken since, for the most part, those who 'do well' and those who do not continue to live side by side. This is also the case of Brazilian migrants who return to live in Presidente Epitácio as, as Raul once said 'you come back to this same life' which includes returning to the same place. When planning their return to Presidente Epitácio migrants buy and build houses in the neighbourhood where they grew up, and where their parents and siblings still tend to live. In most cases they return to the house which they were already building before leaving for Ireland, and in other cases buy a house or a plot of land beside or in the proximity of their parents' and siblings' houses. Yet, in their vast majority, migrants return to houses which have been refurbished and, in most cases, extended to accommodate extra rooms or a swimming pool. The contrast between houses is often visible from the outside in subtle arrangements such as the height of the wall surrounding the house or the existence of an electric fence on top of it which reminds everyone, from families, relatives, friends, neighbours and migrants themselves, of the existence within the neighbourhood of this 'other', 'intimate, yet strange' as Fonseca asserts (2000: Justaposições section, para. 10).¹⁰ The acknowledgment of difference reminds migrants, but kin alike, of their own place in the world, a reminder which is integral to the definition of self. The will to be different and create a life which does not require, as Luis puts it, that 'you earn money during the day

¹⁰ My translation. Original 'íntimo, porém estranho'

so you can eat in the evening' (Interview, March 2011) is taken as obvious, but as Fonseca (2000) also observes, the other side of the coin, which is often ignored, is the anxiety created by this improvement in lifestyle when understood in the context of the neighbourhood and family life.

The reality is that, upon return, life is to be rearranged within the same neighbourhood, surrounded by family and friends who sometimes talk about migrants with a hint of admiration and pride, and others with a hint of recrimination. The recrimination arises from the encounter with strangeness within the realm of the familiar. For example, apart from criticisms addressed at politicians, I never heard a negative comment about the luxurious lifestyle of movie or *telenovela* stars, in fact their lives were commented on with admiration but also distance. Equally, I never heard a comment, except to let me know that, that was where the mayor lived, about the luxurious and gated estate just a short cycle from the neighbourhood where I was living. There, detached houses stood alone, surrounded by bright green patches of grass and trees overlooking the river. Very rarely a SVU would go into the estate but apart from cars the only people I ever saw from the outside of the electric fence around the estate -- there were no walls surrounding the houses, were the gardeners and the security guard who spent his days in his little cubicle by the estate gate, allowing or denying entry. However, there was no sense of recrimination, or envy or jealousy felt towards those who lived there. They arose no comment whatsoever, because, I believe, they had always been the Other, the external and unrelated Other. The relationship with kin is, however, very different.

In Brazil, family is the central and the focal point of social life and it is often defined by consanguinity, although as Ruth Cardoso observes, this is only part of what kinship relations involve since with regards to the bringing up of children:

Socialization or training, in the broadest sense of that term, can also be the basis of real kinship ties. The term *filhos de criação*, which might be translated as “children by socialization,” expresses this fact. (2011: 197)

These relationships also explain the number of children who are informally adopted and brought up by their extended families. Informal adoption of children by relatives goes beyond the scope of the discussion in this document but it serves to illustrate that the kinship structure in Brazil is flexible and inclusive, where the bringing up of children is seen as a common project which involves parents, grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins and close friends. In that sense, the family of orientation predominates.

The definition of family goes beyond the nucleus of parents and children as is clearly illustrated by a conversation I had with two sisters who each had two children. Marta worked outside the house, and Ana minded Marta’s children and often cooked lunch for her. One day, we were making small talk whilst sipping fruit juices by the river front when Ana makes a comment about ‘my four children’. I looked puzzled, and before I had time to question about these two extra children I did not know she had, Marta stated: ‘what do you mean your four children? Two of them are mine!’ to which the other responded: ‘You know what I mean’. What she meant was that by looking after her niece and nephew she cared for them as if they were her own, making it salient the importance of the family of orientation and its role in the transmission of values and morals which extends beyond the family of procreation and involves relatives and close friends, reinforcing the idea that family goes beyond consanguinity. As such, bringing up a child mobilises a network of adults which goes beyond the nuclear and often includes the extended family (Fonseca 2002: 57). However, it should be noted that when referring to migrants who left their children with relatives in Brazil, regardless of the degree of proximity, non-migrants are critical because one thing is to avail of a network of support and another is to, as it was felt, ‘abandon’ their children. During one conversation, a non-migrant noted that, for example, if a teenager breaks a curfew only

the mother will have it within her to go and look for the son or daughter. A relative will, no doubt, worry but there is a kind of action which is reserved only for the mother figure.

Constitution of family is then one of the most important aspects of social cohesion and there was no question during my field research that the main priority for the vast majority of young men and women in Presidente Epitácio was to get married, in fact anyone marrying in their late 20s was seen as already having 'passed the right age'. It also must be noted that once a man and a woman move in together they are referred to as married even if a formal wedding has not taken place. Being single, as Cardoso (2011: 198) also notes, may seem attractive to many but it is also thought of as 'transitional' whereas constituting family is fundamental for acquiring social standing and respect, and encountering a married couple without children is an incredibly rare event. Cardoso observes that marriage is desirable because it leads to a family, the ultimate goal is procreation, and notes that during her field research 'no one thought that a couple without children formed a family in the true sense of the term ... Children are at one and the same time a source of pleasure, suffering, and help, because all these things are encompassed by the notion of family.' (2011: 198) Family is a wide concept, which often involves parents and grandparents, siblings, and blood relatives such as cousins, aunts and uncles, but interestingly it usually does not include the husband who 'has his own family' (Kottak 1996: 141). Children are often the link between the families and, as such, 'belong' to both. The distinct separation between the husband's and the wife's family, and the loyalty owed to one's blood family, is particularly important in the migratory context. Brothers have an important role in the protection of their sisters, even if they are married, and as guardians of morality. They are at the same time protectors of body and of soul, and more often than not their opinion weighs more than that of husbands themselves. Julia, a woman in her 30s commented that her

husband never wanted to come to Ireland but ‘my brothers convinced him and told him that he had to come because we didn’t own a house’ (Interview, April 2011). During the time in Ireland, the help provided to the families in Brazil, as discussed earlier, by sending parents a steady monthly income or by sending punctual amounts to pay for specific projects such as the refurbishment of their house or medical expenses, is often closely observed by both families and friends, often creating silent rivalries where stock is taken as to ‘who gives what to whom’ which comes to symbolise the distance that separates family members, and serves as measure to the commitment and affection that families members have for one another. This becomes of paramount importance within the context of migration, not only in the ‘selection’ of relatives who are helped to travel to Ireland and the difficulties of those who have no families abroad, but also highlights the weight that local networks have in the development of reciprocal relationships of support and help on an everyday basis.

Equally important is the impact that migration has on local gender roles. This impact is often not of a practical nature but seems to be more symbolic. Traditional roles dictate that one of the pillars of social identity of men is their role as the breadwinner. Even if women work, it is rare that their salary equals that of their husband’s which is often much higher. The public image of men is of protectors of and providers to the family, and often a good father is defined by the statement that ‘he has never left my children go hungry’, and a ‘good man’ is also defined by his generosity towards his family and friends, and the financial help he is willing to give, especially if that means giving not what he has in excess but what he also needs himself. On the other hand, the role of women seems to revolve around motherhood and caring for the house. It was not infrequent to go into someone else’s house and being welcomed by the sentence ‘please, don’t look: the house is a mess’, when the house was in fact spotless. Being praised for their role as a good mother and keeping a spotless house is a

compliment that when voiced in public is a source of respect and good social standing. As Fonseca notes, ‘attacking these attributes in public, usually through gossip, is attacking the very core of one’s identity and the image that the individual has of herself’ (2000: A Importância da Reputação section, para. 2).¹¹

These relationships are indicative of the protective role played by family, in the extended sense of family, in assuring the well-being of its members and serves to illustrate the impact that migration has on the restructuring of power relations. The cosmopolitan experiences of women in Ireland, through the ‘conquering’ of a newly found individual freedom through frequent access to money and the recognition of their work with a salary which they consider as equal, or sometimes even higher to that of her husband, is often unattainable upon return. In fact, and especially because return is often evaluated in relation to the use of time in Ireland and the financial achievements gained during that time, the fact that a woman might decide to work upon her return is understood as a weakness and impacts on the public image of her husband who is seen as being unable to provide for his family. For women on the other hand, the process of migration exposed them to a situation where their work is considered as valuable, symbolically and in monetary terms, and is often illustrated by statements like ‘my boss really likes me, sometimes I’m cleaning and she tells me to stop and come and sit down and have coffee with her; this would never happen in Brazil, in fact, there they would ask you to use the service door’ (Interview, July 2011). Upon return, and in the absence of work qualifications, women are not willing to work in poorly paid jobs where they are ‘considered inferior’ by their new bosses and which leaves them feeling diminished. Of the women who work outside the house upon their return to Brazil, they tend to be either single mothers who generally set up their own businesses as beauticians and hair-dressers or in retail, or are young women who used to work in retail and who return to

¹¹ My translation. Original ‘Atacar, pela fofoca, os atributos de um e de outro é atentar contra o que há de mais íntimo no indivíduo, a imagem que ele faz de si.’

their former position. However, it must be noted that for a woman or a man to find work after the age of thirty-five-years-old is extremely difficult unless they have very good work connections. Upon return to Brazil, women must deal with the pressure to follow and comply with moral and family behaviours which pushes them to their traditional role of stay-at-home mother, a role which is not always easy to negotiate with their previous experiences of 'the modern woman' in Ireland.

The above highlights the pressure that kinship dynamics have on migrants upon their return and offers insight into the negotiations that take place in the everyday to respond to the commitments that individuals have to one other. But the limitations that family and social obligations pose on life in Brazil must not be seen as negative. To be sure, they are restrictive and impose limits on what one can and cannot do, but they are also a source of comfort and certainty, they represent the familiar and the known. Moreover, they probe questions as to how migrants might navigate between their affections and commitments to family and kin, and the strategies they create to respond to their experiences of cosmopolitanism. Beyond the disjunctures that migration inevitably generates, commitment and affection remain, and so disjuncture and community coexist, feeding off each other rather annulling one another. They do not represent a before and an after, but an inclusion of present circumstance which takes account of both.

By looking at kinship ties in the context of return migration, I think it is possible to have a clearer view of these areas of intersections, that is, areas where individual freedom develops and allows the migrant to develop their own life-project with relative independence from social obligations, and where, at the same time, these obligations are reconciled with loyalty felt to kin and to place, which suggest that everyday encounters and relations are not only developed as belonging exclusively to the present time, when they are being lived, but seem to connect us to past and future. Here I find the concepts

of ‘joint commitment’, ‘affect or belonging’, and ‘forms of association’ proposed by Vered Amit (Amit and Rapport 2012) helpful to investigate the ambiguities created by the experience of migration and the contact that migrants have with an alternative form of modernity in Ireland, as well as an attachment and commitment that they continue to sustain with their kin in Brazil. It is in these spaces of intersection that uncertainties and anxieties arise, but it is also here that everyday life is lived and negotiated. Amit proposes that joint commitment be considered as a ‘kind of interdependence [which] is just as likely to engender tensions, conflict and anxiety’ ((Amit and Rapport 2012: 8), and not exclusively a commitment that ensures harmony as argued by Gilbert: ‘if we are jointly committed, each one’s “individual commitments” stands or falls with the “individual commitment” of the other. They cannot exit apart’ (cited in Amit and Rapport 2012: 7). As such, joint commitment adds another dimension to the kind of ‘open-ended relationships’ that Graeber proposes, and which I have discussed above, because whilst they are an agreement ‘in which each party commits itself to maintaining the life of the other’ (2001: 65) they can also be deeply troubling on a personal level, and thus these commitments are equally social and personal. In many ways, the tensions generated are not a threat to social cohesion or personal development but they must be managed in everyday interactions, allowing for distance to increase and decrease depending on the different social exchanges in daily life. In the light of the above, and as Amit notes, ‘placing the emphasis on joint commitment shifts the emphasis away from sameness, whether actual or imagined, as the basis for community and puts the onus more squarely on interdependence as the basis for this class of sociation’ (Amit and Rapport 2012: 8).

The question for Brazilian migrants is: how is this tension negotiated and expressed upon return? Amit (Amit and Rapport 2012: 9) avers that unfamiliar circumstances create the environment for explicit assertions of belonging to take shape.

Common to the vast majority of migrants who had already returned to Brazil at the time of fieldwork, was the initial desire to reunite with their families, friends, and Brazil itself. Luis and Vitoria, upon their return to Brazil, were confronted with the thought that Brazil was indeed ‘their world’, but it was a world which was now being considered in the context of and being compared to the ‘First World’. This world only crystallized after their return to Presidente Epitácio, and Brazil came to be a place which, although they had lived there for the most part of their lives, they now felt that they had to ‘isolate’ themselves from. The pressure and the acknowledgment of difference which they recognised in themselves, and which was also clear to others, made them feel that, for the first time in their lives, they only half-belonged, they were the stranger and the intimate at the same time, positioned in and outside the community; what was important in their lives and which made them consider going back to Ireland, was the ambiguity they felt towards Brazil and towards Ireland. As Lucas explained, ‘sometimes I leave the house and, to be truthful, I don’t know where I’m going, I have no place to go’ (Interview, July 2011), and this was not because he did not have family or friends but simply he felt he had ‘no one to talk to’, someone who could understand his inner predicament and doubts about his place in the world. For Lucas, and others like Alice, return was a question of ‘keeping pressing on’, of moving forward and placing the experience of Ireland at the back of their minds. Therefore, and whilst migration is often discussed and expressed in collective terms, the reality is that, as Amit rightly suggests:

If we have to leave open the possibility that there may be a wide range of affect intersecting with different circumstances of plural subjecthood, then surely we also need to allow for the possibility that any one situation or case might also provoke a variety of different responses as well. In other words, if a joint commitment is not necessarily associated with consensus, by the same token why should we assume that it is associated with only one kind of affect or sense of belonging? (Amit and Rapport 2012: 10)

This means that particular social and kinship obligations enacted in joint commitments are kept in balance by everyday negotiations and transactions, and are not always in line with one's sense of belonging to place and 'community'. Moreover, forms of association are shaped by these interrelations, and in the case of Brazilian migrants who had already returned to Brazil it was not infrequent to see returned migrants gathered at the house of other returned migrants, eating and drinking, or planning an outing or a barbecue. It was the experience of Ireland, greatly influenced by experiences of consumption and financial transactions through a wider availability of money, as well as a shared, even if not always common, notion of modernity which brought them together without necessarily meaning to include or exclude non-migrants. Rather, meaning was created within those areas of interaction where joint commitments and a sense of belonging do not intersect with their relatives and friends who did not emigrate. Beyond the disjunctures that the experience of migration seems to imprint in the lives of migrants and non-migrants, the spontaneous aspect of 'community', with its expanding and regressive possibilities remains. Furthermore, as Amit observes, disjuncture is not only fruit of an imposition or as something that just happens, but it can also be something one desires, in that:

If people may wish to sometimes join together, they may equally wish in other instances to leave. And the latter may involve the same degree of complexity and creativity as the former. (Amit and Rapport 2012: 32)

However, the desire for disjuncture and separation, in the case of Brazilian migrants, does not come without feelings of ambivalence, especially because desire for disjuncture is taken, by non-migrants, as a rejection of their affect and love. As such, the strangeness introduced by separation seems of crucial importance because cosmopolitanism might just be, when all is said and done, the willingness of migrants to coexist with a level of strangeness regardless of the choice being between the familiar stranger in Brazil or the absolute stranger in Ireland which is slowly becoming familiar.

In other words, there is freedom in obligation, and there is freedom in the commitment that individuals have to one another, even if this freedom is not unconditional. Equally, it seems to me that there is also obligation in freedom, and in the obligation to be free. The cosmopolitan, even if an *unintended cosmopolitan*, recognises at some level that individual freedom and social obligation are two sides of the same coin and aims to reconcile these two apparently contradictory notions through a degree of joint commitment, belonging and association. Obligation and commitments to kin should not be seen as representing a lack of freedom, although they do impose limits, but these limits can and are challenged in daily life. The same can be said about individual freedom acquired in Ireland through money. By considering their membership in the group and their own individual ambitions, migrants make choices which may lead them to remain in Brazil upon return or consider returning to Ireland. Although being identified as the stranger, migrants, in their own individual capacity, challenge these views and find their place in the world by stepping outside social, cultural and political determinations.

These choices are cosmopolitan in nature, they are complex and ambivalent, and they oppose the notion of cultural wholes. As such, migrants are not 'slaves' of their own culture and social milieu, but are individuals making decisions in a social world, constantly debating and considering the implications that their own freewill might impose on their relationships with others and on themselves. This is a journey of self-discovery where the 'I' and the 'We' meet, a relationship which is permanently and consistently being created, maintained and modified. In this sense, I approach the migration process as a human and ethical phenomenon centred in the individual himself or herself and the other, precisely because the migrant cannot be dissociated from the moral world. And perhaps, this is the real threat to a 'sedentarist' political discourse, insofar as migrants have the ability to become part of different nations and belong to

different communities without this implying a rupture or mutilation of any of the two. What this requires then is that we consider a more fluid understanding of belonging, commitments, loyalties and obligations. This, I feel, is the cosmopolitan project that the migrant might choose to undertake, that is, the capacity to challenge the stability of the nation-state and by so doing he opens up a whole new project which, co-existing with difference, looks at, first and foremost, our common humanity.

CONCLUSION

At the heart of Irish migration policy is the premise that ‘a foreigner has not right, as such to enter or be in Ireland’ (www.oireachtasdebates.oireachtas.ie). This is, of course, a premise that is in no way different from what is proposed by many other countries around the world. Liisa Malkki (1991) reminds us that the partition of the world in separate units is a response to a ‘sedentarism in our thinking’ which ascribes people to specific territorial places where they belong to, places where they are rooted, places which become impoverished once the person leaves, in other words, uproots himself or herself and settles somewhere else. The sedentarism in our thinking has the immediate consequence of creating physical, emotional but also political barriers, which divide us between foreigners and nationals, who enjoy a very different set of rights. And so, we have become accustomed and have interiorized it so deeply that, as Julia Kristeva states, we have reached ‘the point of considering it normal that there are foreigners, that is, people who do not have the same rights as we do’ (1991: 103). The existence of ‘the foreigner’, as the person who does not belong is then problematised, and in the meanwhile a moral problem is transformed into ‘the corrigibility of an institutional one’ (Kleinman 1998: 395). And so, migration policies come to be formulated to respond to the presence of the ‘stranger’, the Other who does not belong, and to address, as Abdelmalek Sayad argues, the ‘social problem of immigrants’ (Sayad 1999: 178 [original emphasis]).

One of the core arguments in chapter one is the importance of reconstructing complete migrant trajectories (see Sayad 1999: 29ff), attending to the complexities of migration as a process that expands from pre-migration to possible re-migration and whose parts are not reducible to independent units or to a series of discontinuous and fixed events. Therefore, I suggest that the discussion of migration in general, and of Brazilian migrants to Naas in particular, must recognise a multitude of causes that initiate, prevent, and sustain the movement of Brazilian migrants from a small town in

Brazil to Ireland, and from Ireland to Brazil. Moreover, to understand the processes behind return, we must understand initial departure and life in Ireland allowing for the analyses of the complexities and uncertainties of everyday life. Through this, I argue that migrants challenge many of the cultural and national common-sense assumptions which are present in policy, and create lives which are, unmistakably, in motion. Through the work of Raymond Williams (1977) I note that a main difficulty in migration policy is the absence of 'structures of feeling', that is, those kind of experiences which cannot yet be rationalised and which, for that reason create a discomfort within policy which is often devoid of any affective notions and any present experience. Therefore, I argue that we must attend to the emotional and cultural realities which are produced in daily life and which escape, quite often, quantification and measurement. Chapter one also proposes that the migratory movement from Brazilian migrants to Ireland be considered in three distinct waves of migration which are framed around temporal considerations and the limitations imposed by institutional and policy restrictions which influence the everyday of Brazilian migrants in Ireland, and ultimately transform kinship relations.

Chapter two offers an examination into systems of credit and debt, and the social and moral obligations attached to them. Moreover, it addresses the role of money as the source of individual freedom which must be mediated in the context of kinship commitments. The act of migrating and the wider availability of money introduce new dimensions to relationships and force the restructuring of family and kinship relations. During the process of migration and through the distance that such process imposes, forms of reciprocity are rethought and reshaped. Here I attend to the impact that a wider availability of money has on kinship and reciprocal relations as well as neighbourhood credit-debt dynamics and the moral obligations associated with them which are especially important in the context of return migration. In general, for Brazilian

migrants, money earned abroad frees them from many of their social obligations and from forms of reciprocity that largely dictate that their own interests should come second to the interests of the group. And in the light of this, money liberates and affords personal freedom but also increases social distance. I argue, nevertheless, that it is through the possibilities that money affords that the relationships with families and relatives are maintained and perpetuated, and new complexities in the relationships appear. Even when migrants have been introduced to money proper in a quantity that they were unfamiliar with, I argue that money becomes part of the relationships already in existence. In that sense money is not merely a means of exchange or a measure of value, but is also personal because it aggregates its calculability and its impersonal characteristics with the personal aspects embedded in human and kinship transactions. The availability of money introduces new complexities in the relationships amongst migrants but also between migrants and non-migrants and these complexities require, amongst other things, that one becomes familiarised with the intricacies of new rules of moral reasoning, as well as with new modes of evaluation and calculation of investments in relationships in a social context which is developing at a distance.

Chapter three explores the responses that Brazilians give to the time ‘gained’ in Ireland, which can potentially translate into money through the process of migration, which coupled with a certain experience of modernity acquires temporal meaning. These responses are explored in relation to the notion of opportunity-cost and the subsequent judgements and assessments that migrants make of their fellow migrants and of their own time spent in Ireland. I suggest that, contrary to common wisdom, movement in space is not always time consuming, in fact migrants evaluate their time in Ireland as ‘wasting time’ or ‘gaining time’ depending on the outcome of the relationship between opportunity-cost, and therefore when Brazilian migrants refer to time spent in Ireland they speak of something that can be appropriated to create something which

should not exist. As such, time is viewed as a resource. This chapter also attends to an alternative mode of modernity which migrants experience as a world without social contradictions, and so Ireland is experienced as the modernity project even if this is not always aligned with the experiences of modernity that Irish scholars discuss. This is viewed in the light of the various technologies behind the exercise of neoliberal policies which permit the management of national territories as a heterogeneous political and economic space, and through this we start to unmask other forms of power and exclusion which are not tied to national territories but which flourish within them. In Ireland, Brazilian migrants have come into contact with a new version of the modern project and of neoliberalism different from their experiences in Brazil. I suggest that migrants desire much of what they have experienced as modern in Ireland and construct lives where alternative modernities are being tailored to their own historical and social worlds, and where modes of survival and ‘enjoyment’ are being fashioned. I argue that, in Ireland, migrants came into contact with the tools to respond to the claims of the market, to respond to the call of the consumer society through a wider availability of money. Through accumulation, consumption as anticipation, surplus, a world of excess is defined as is the possibility to becoming another person. Ireland presents migrants with the new possibilities that the world of consumption allows, where nearly anything can be bought and sold, and with a sense of immediacy and equality never felt before. Whilst Ireland comes to define a place where economic freedom can be attained, it also reminds migrants that their lives have changed in Ireland through the consumption of goods which were unattainable in the past, and reminds them that these experiences take centre stage by which all future experience is to be measured against.

Chapter four explores the ambiguities and disconnections created by the boundaries imposed by the self and the contours of an ever changing social world. Here I examine the notion of melancholia to capture these social transformations and the

transformations of the self. Return to Brazil requires a re-acquaintance with old life trajectories and requires the learning of new points of reference. The central argument in this chapter revolves around the question as to how migrants go on, upon their return to Brazil, in the presence of alterity. Upon 'permanent' return to Brazil, the migrant is forced to make a decision and live a life where references to forms of life in Ireland must be repressed and shared only in intimate conversations with other returned migrants with whom empathy is possible. Hence, return to Brazil is experienced as a general melancholic condition shared by those who emigrated. Return demands re-ordering the social world, and the coming to terms with the out-of-placeness of one's behaviours, thoughts and actions; it requires dealing with the 'gestation of uncertainty', and requires the very personal and intimate challenge of dealing with the void created by the possibility of a different life. And therefore, the dominant sentiment amongst returned migrants -- at least for those in the extremes of experience, that is, those who have done very well in Ireland and those who returned worse than they were before migrating -- is disappointment. This feeling, is not only directed towards the external world but it is also directed at the self and articulated in the fact that the financial success in Ireland is without reach in Brazil. However, the migrant refuses to let go of a time that is already gone and live in a state of permanent of inbetweenness. I argue that the ideal-loss of what Ireland represented was never something that could be lost because it never existed, at least not in a permanent state. Therefore, melancholy of Ireland is not the loss of the attachment to a place, or even to a lifestyle but it is rather a loss of a possibility, which in turn triggers a loss of desire.

In chapter five I argue that, as migrants reflect on their experiences of life in Brazil and life in Ireland, they articulate their thoughts as a tension between two wills pulling in different directions, between the individual freedom that Ireland affords them through a wider availability of money and consumption, and the moral imperatives and

commitments which sustain their relationships to their kin in Brazil and ultimately enables the migrant's return to Brazil. This tension, although painful is already a moment of possibility, and it is as much personal as it is social, and it is as much cosmopolitan as it is communitarian. And so, I argue that whilst the migrant displays cosmopolitanism through the experience of difference created by the migratory process, the migrant also remains deeply committed to traditional kinship expectations and patterns of reciprocity. However, these experiences of difference through the contact with the Stranger and the Other imprint a sense of uncertainty and doubt in everyday life, both in Ireland and upon return to Brazil, and become a central element in the lives of migrants. I conclude that it is in spaces of disjuncture and intersection that uncertainties and anxieties arise, but it is also here that everyday life is lived and negotiated. In the light of this, the *unintended cosmopolitan*, recognises at some level that individual freedom and social obligation are two sides of the same coin and aims to reconcile these two apparently contradictory notions through a degree of joint commitment, belonging and association. As such, migrants are not 'slaves' of their own culture and social milieu, but are individuals making decisions in a social world, constantly debating and considering the implications that their own freewill might impose on their relationships with others and on themselves.

Coming to terms with the thought that migrants may choose to live here and there was perhaps the most constant and challenging thought throughout this thesis, because it seemed to me that our loyalties must be to a particular place and to a particular people. However, observations from fieldwork led me to consider that the complexity of experience and feelings is such that migrants negotiate their lives in spaces of disjuncture, moments which are not fully coherent or determinate, and in these moments their kinship commitments and their own individual projects are reworked and renegotiated, and, for that reason, life extends and expands beyond fixed loyalties. I

came to realise that by living lives here and there, migrants are not ‘doomed’ to oscillate between the sending country and the receiving country which have become ‘countries of exile’, as Sayad (1999: 17) suggests, countries where migrants find they no longer belong to. Rather, Brazilian migrants have exposed themselves to new possibilities of life where individual freedom acquired in Ireland marries kinship obligations in Brazil, and thus experiences from Ireland and from Brazil cannot simply be dissociated. And so, migrants come to feel that they belong to these two places, not fully of one nor the other.

Anthropology involves a commitment to study actually lived lives that often confound abstract theories about measurable individual behaviour, theories favoured by economists and, more often than not, by states concerned with the governmental management of migration (Graeber 2001: 5ff). In that sense, anthropology can speak to and inform policy by giving priority, or at least, an equal place to the study of the social, cultural and kinship ties which create and sustain migratory movements. As such, anthropology can, and in my view should, build bridges between policy knowledge and qualitative knowledge which can provide fertile ground for a reworking of alternatives to the ‘sedentarism in our thinking’ (Malkki 1992).

Literature on migration studies have tended to focus on what has been lost through the process of migration, and so the migrant is problematised and is perceived as a suffering being, uprooted and in need of integration. I have tried to distance myself from studies which view the migrant in these terms and have found solid ground in recent research on cosmopolitanism which I think is helpful here in enabling us to go beyond the study of migrants within territorial borders and thinking about individuals as potential cosmopolitans able of effectively navigate different cultural settings.

Cosmopolitanism (see Amit and Rapport 2012) offers a platform for thinking about migrants as people negotiating their lives in places of ‘disjuncture’ where life-projects

are being fashioned and tailored to respond to a kind of freedom found in the experience of difference, a balance achieved through the incorporation, in the everyday, of kinship obligations and the obligation to oneself. Cosmopolitanism (Josephides 2014; Rapport 2012) also enables us to think about the moral and the existential conditions of being human, and offers a path of enquire that leads to the study of the migrant as a citizen of the world, capable of going beyond his or her culture and finding freedom in the process. As I was once told by a group of migrants, ‘too much freedom is not good. All freedom has to have limits’. This suggests that choices are complex and ambivalent, and that this process is not without suffering in the determination of new limits. Nevertheless, it is already cosmopolitan in nature, it is a project of emancipation and freedom worked out within the limits and the loyalties owed to kin and place, and to oneself.

Migration research in Ireland has been dominated by ideas of ‘rootedness’, and migration studies have tended to focus on acculturation models which render migrants as people ‘in need’ of integration through strategies and integration programmes which are evaluated according to a spectrum of success and failure. Although these studies may have their merits, my view is that they ignore the complexities of cultural expression which takes place in the everyday, and do not seem to account for the fact that such models have a place only insofar as we understand people ascribed to specific national territories. By ignoring the fact that migration is not only about immigration, but is a complex process in which emigration, immigration, and return migration coexist, studies of migration are bound to be ‘partial and ethnocentric’ (Sayad 1999: 29), and ultimately will have limited contributions to make to the study of migration broadly.

This thesis is the result of over a three year long period, during which multi-sited ethnographic research was conducted in Ireland and in Brazil with Brazilian migrants

and their families and friends. Travelling across borders and cultural lines afforded me the opportunity to go beyond and behind cultural and national common-sense assumptions and into the everyday life of Brazilian migrants to Ireland and upon their return to Brazil. Based on this work, I propose that we must allow for alternatives to 'sedentarist' dimensions in our thinking to develop, allowing for the possibility that migrants may decide to live here and there without necessarily 'rooting' themselves anywhere.

One of the things that this thesis has shown is the complex reality of human stories that go beyond simplistic and 'cartoonish' images which often forget the complexity of human life. What I have tried to achieve is to come to a clearer understanding of many of the anthropological concerns that speak to cosmopolitan and communitarian values. From a policy point of view, I think that much can be learnt from the everyday experiences of migrants who through daily negotiations with themselves and others create spaces of dialogue in those moment of uncertainty that migration creates.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu-Rabia, Aref (2008) A Native Palestinian Anthropologist in Palestinian-Israeli Cosmopolitanism. In: *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism*, Pnina Werbner ed. Pp. 159-172. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Adler, Rachel (2000) Human Agency in International Migration: The Maintenance of International Social Fields by Yucatecan Migrants in a Southwestern City. *Mexican Studies/ Estudios Mexicanos*, 16(1): 165-187.

Amit, Vered and Nigel Rapport (2012) *Community, Cosmopolitanism and the Problem of Human Commonality*. London: Pluto Press.

Anthias, Floya (2007) Ethnic ties: social capital and the question of mobilisability. *The Sociological Review*, 55(4): 788-805.

Appadurai, Arjun (1990) Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 7(2): 295-310.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony (1997) Cosmopolitan Patriots. *Critical Inquiry*, 23(3): 617-639.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2001) Liberalism, Individuality, and Identity. *Critical Inquiry*, 27(2): 305-332.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2006) *Cosmopolitanism: ethics in a world of strangers*. London: Penguin Books.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2007) Global Citizenship. *Fordham Law Review*, 75(5): 2375-2391.

Arensberg, Conrad M. (1988) *The Irish Countryman*. Waveland Press, Inc.

Bateson, Gregory (1935) Culture, Contact and Schismogenesis. *Man*, 35: 178-183.

Baudrillard, Jean (1998) *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. London: Sage Publications.

Bauman, Zygmunt (1988) *Freedom*. University of Minnesota Press.

Bauman, Zygmunt (1998) *Postmodernity and its Discontents*. Polity Press.

Beck, Ulrich (2002) The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(1-2): 17-44.

Benjamin, Walter (1969) *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books.

Berry, John W. (2005) Acculturation: Living successfully in two culture. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29: 697-712.

Biehl, João (2005) *Vita - Life in a Zone of Social Abandonment*. University of California Press.

Blom Hansen, Thomas (2012) *Melancholia of Freedom - Social Life in an Indian Township in South Africa*. Princeton University Press.

Blom Hansen, Thomas (2005) Melancholia of Freedom: Humour and Nostalgia among Indians in South Africa. *Modern Drama*, 48(2): 297-315.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1977) *The Kabyle house or the world reversed*. In *Algeria 1960*. Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1990) *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1984) *Distinction - A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Harvard University Press.

Borjas, George J. (1989) Economic Theory And International Migration. *International Migration Review*, 23 (3): 457-485.

Byron, Margaret and Condon, Stephanie (1996) A Comparative Study of Caribbean Return Migration from Britain and France: Towards a Context-Dependent Explanation. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographer*, 21(1):91-104.

Breckenridge, Carol and Arjun Appadurai (1989) On Moving Targets. *Public Culture*, 2(1): i-iv.

Brettell, Caroline (2007) Adjustment of Status, Remittances, and Return: Some Observations on 21st Century Migration Processes. *City & Society*, 19(1):47-59.

Butler, Judith (1997) *The Psychic Life of Power - Theories in Subjection*. Stanford University Press.

Cardoso, Ruth (1984) Creating Kinship: The Fostering of Children In Favela Families in Brazil. Elizabeth Hansen trans. In: *Kinship Ideology and Practice in Latin America*. Raymond T. Smith ed. The University of North Carolina Press.

Carneiro, Julia (2012) Groundbreaking soap opera grips Brazil. BBC Brasil. [Online]. 19 October. [Accessed 7 July 2014]. Available from: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-latin-america-20001198>

Castles, Stephen and Miller, Mark J. (1998) *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. New York: Palgrave.

Comaroff, Jean and John L. Comaroff (2012) *Theory From The South. Or, How Euro-America Is Evolving Toward Africa*. London: Paradigm Publishers.

Commission of the European Communities (2005) Communication from the commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions - Migration and Development: some concrete orientations. [Online]. 1 October. [Accessed 28 October 2014]. Available from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52005DC0390&from=EN>

- Commission of the European Communities (2006) Communication from the commission to the Council and the European Parliament - The Global Approach to Migration one year on: Towards a comprehensive European migration policy. [Online]. 30 November. [Accessed 29 October 2014]. Available from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52006DC0735&from=EN>
- Crowley, Una; Mary Gilmartin and Rob Kitchin (2006). Vote Yes for Common Sense Citizenship: Immigration and the Paradoxes at the Heart of Ireland's 'C ad M le F ilte'. *NIRSA Working Paper Series* 30(March): 1-35.
- Das, Veena (1998) Wittgenstein and Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 27: 171-95.
- Das, Veena (2007) *Life and Words: Violence and the descent into the ordinary*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1997) *Negotiations 1972-1990*. Columbia University Press.
- Douglas, Mary (2000 [1990]) Foreword. In: Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift*. (1990). London: Routledge, vii-xviii.
- Douglas, Mary (2002) *Purity and Danger - An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. Routledge.
- Erciy s, Jade Cemre (2008) Diaspora of Diaspora: Adyge-Abkhaz Returnees in the Ancestral Homeland. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 17(3): 340-361.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland (2014) The Cartoon Controversy and the Possibility of Cosmopolitanism. In: *We the cosmopolitans: moral and existential conditions of being human*. Josephides, Lisette and Hall, Alexandra, eds. Pp. 135-155. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- European Commission (2007) Return Migration. European Migration Network.
- European Union (2008) Europa, Summaries of EU legislation. [Online]. [Accessed 31 January 2014]. Available from: http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/justice_freedom_security/free_movement_of_persons_asylum_immigration/114509_en.htm
- Evans-Pritchard (1939) Nuer Time-Reckoning. *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 12(2): 189-216.
- Evans-Pritchard (1940) *The Nuer – A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press.
- Fanning, Bryan (2002) *Racism and Social Change in the Republic of Ireland*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Fanning, Bryan and Mutwarasibo, Fidele (2007). National/non-national: Immigration, citizenship and politics in the Republic of Ireland. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(3): 439-460.

- Fanning, Bryan (2009) *New Guests of the Irish Nation*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press.
- Fradon, Richard (2008) Cosmopolitan Nations, National Cosmopolitans. In: *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism*, Pnina Werbner ed. Pp. 233-260. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Featherstone, Mike (1991) *Consumer Culture & Postmodernism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fonseca, Cláudia (2000) *Família, Fofoca e Honra*. Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul.[Online]. [Accessed 18 September 2014]. Available from: http://minhateca.com.br/ceiogcruz/Livros/pdf/Claudia_Fonseca_-_FAMILIA*2c_FOFOCA_E_HONRA,14094746.pdf
- Fonseca, Cláudia (2002) Mãe é Uma Só? Reflexões em Torno de Alguns Casos Brasileiros. *Psicologia USP*, 13(2): 49-68.
- Freud, Sigmund (2001 [1957]) *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of psycho-Analysis.
- Garcia, Angela (2010) *The Pastoral Clinic - Addiction and Dispossession along the Rio Grande*. University of California Press.
- Gardner, Katy (1993) Desh-Bidesh: Sylheti Images of Home and Away. *Man* 28(1): 1-15.
- Gay y Blasco, Paloma (2010) The fragility of cosmopolitanism: a biographical approach. *Social Anthropology*, 18(4): 403-409.
- Geertz, Clifford (1983) *Local Knowledge - Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology*. Basic Books Inc.
- Geertz, Clifford (2000) *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books.
- Gibbons, Luke (1988) Coming Out of Hibernation? The Myth of Modernity in Irish Culture. In: *Across the Frontiers. Ireland in the 1990s*. Richard Kearney ed. Pp. 205-218. Wolfhound Press.
- Glick Schiller, Nina, Linsa Basch and Cristina Szanton Blanc (1995) From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 68 (1): 48-63.
- Godbout, Jacques T. (1998) Introduction: Does the Gift (Still) Exist? In: *The World of the Gift*. In collaboration with Alain Caillé. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Godoy, Benedito (2002) *História de Presidente Epitácio*. Presidente Epitácio.
- Gouveia, Diana (2009) 'Living in Ireland is Like Living in One's Neighbour's House': Brazilian Immigrants in Naas. *Irish Journal of Anthropology*, 9(3):75-78.

- Gouveia, Diana (2010) Ireland. In: *Migration, Employment and Labour Market Integration Policies in the European Union*. Anna Platonova and Giuliana Urso, eds. Pp. 123-134. International Organization for Migration (IOM).
- Graeber, David (2001) *Toward an Anthropological Theory of Value - The False Coin of our own Dreams*. Palgrave.
- Graeber, David (2008) On Cosmopolitan and (Vernacular) Democratic Creativity: Or, There Never Was a West. In: *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism*, Prina Werbner ed. Pp. 281-308. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Graeber, David (2012) *Debt, the first 5.000 years*. Melville House Publishing.
- Gray, Anne (2008) Some Reflections on Gift Theory and Social Capital. In: *Social Capital*, Gupta, K.R, Gunnar Lind Haase Svendsen, Prasenjit Maiti eds. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors (P) Ltd.
- Green, Sarah (2013) Borders and the Relocation of Europe. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42: 345-361.
- Gregory, Chris (2012) On money debt and morality: some reflections on the contribution of economic anthropology. *Social Anthropology, Special Issue: the debt issue*, 20(4): 380-396.
- Grønseth, Anne Sigfrid (2014) Experiences of Pain: A Gateway to Cosmopolitan Subjectivity? In: *We the cosmopolitans: moral and existential conditions of being human*. Josephides, Lisette and Hall, Alexandra, eds. Pp. 90-110. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Guyer, J. (2004) *Marginal Gains: Monetary Transactions in Atlantic Africa*. Chicago: University Chicago Press.
- Hall, Alexandra (2014) Cosmopolitan Morality in the British Immigration and Asylum System. In: *We the cosmopolitans: moral and existential conditions of being human*. Josephides, Lisette and Hall, Alexandra, eds. Pp. 68-89. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Hannerz, Ulf (1990) Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 7(2): 237-251.
- Hannerz, Ulf (2010) Afterthoughts: world watching. *Social Anthropology*, 18(4): 448-453.
- Harrington, John A. (2005). Citizenship and the Biopolitics of Post-nationalist Ireland. *Journal of Law and Society*, 32(3): 424-449.
- Hart, Keith (2007) Money is always personal and impersonal. *Anthropology Today*, 23(5):12-16.
- Hart, Keith (2010) Kant, 'anthropology' and the new human universal. *Social Anthropology*, 18(4): 441-447.
- Harvey, David (1990) *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Blackwell Publishing.

- Hatoum, Milton (2010) *Cinzas do Norte*. Companhia de Bolso.
- Healy, Claire (2006) Carnival to Galway, The Brazilian Community in Gort, 1999-2006. [Online] [Accessed 15 November 2013]. Available from: http://www.irlandeses.org/healy_gort.htm
- Hess, Christin (2008) What Are “Reverse Diasporas” and How Are We to Understand Them? *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 17(3): 288-315.
- High, Holly (2011) Melancholia and Anthropology. *American Ethnologist*, 38(2): 217-233.
- Hodgson, Dorothy L. (2008) Cosmopolitics, Neoliberalism, and the State: The Indigenous Rights Movement in Africa. In: *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism*, Pnina Werbner ed. Pp. 215-132. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- IBGE (2010) Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. [Online]. [Accessed 21 November 2013]. Available from: <http://www.ibge.gov.br/estadosat/perfil.php?sigla=sp#>
- Jackson, Michael (2002) *The Politics of Storytelling: Violence, Transgression, and Inter-subjectivity*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Jackson, Michael (2005) *Existential Anthropology: Events, Exigencies, and Effects*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Jackson, Michael (2009) *The Palm at the End of the Mind: Relatedness, Religiosity, and the Real*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Josephides, Lisette (2010) Cosmopolitanism as the existential condition of humanity. *Social Anthropology*, 18(4): 389-395.
- Josephides, Lisette (2014) Introduction: We the Cosmopolitans: Framing the Debate. In: *We the cosmopolitans: moral and existential conditions of being human*. Josephides, Lisette and Hall, Alexandra, eds. Pp. 1-28. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- King, Russell, Anastasia Christou, Ivor Goodson and Janine Teerling (2008) Tales of Satisfaction and Disillusionment: Second-Generation “Return” Migration to Greece and Cyprus. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*. 17(3) 262-287.
- Kleinman, Arthur (1998) Experience and Its Moral Modes: Culture, Human Conditions and Disorder. *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, delivered at Stanford University. [Online]. 13-16 April. [Accessed 14 October 2014]. Available from: <http://tannerlectures.utah.edu/documents/a-to-z/k/Kleinman99.pdf>
- Korin, Eliana Catão and Sueli S. de Carvalho Petry (2005) Brazilian Families. In: *Ethnicity and Family Therapy*. Monica McGoldrick, Joe Giordano and Nydia Garcia-Preto eds. Pp. 166-177. The Guildford Press. [Online]. [Accessed 26 November 2013]. Available from: http://books.google.ie/books?id=6A11kB_6GyMC&pg=PA170&lpg=PA170&dq=Kotta+k+in+the+united+states+identity+emerges&source=bl&ots=cU8im_CjK1&sig=ZEsbaG

[IYooULV-EMpO7STUBbGM4&hl=en&sa=X&ei=Pp2UUvPdF4bPhAfkvICQAw&ved=0CCoQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=Kottak%20in%20the%20united%20states%20identity%20emerges&f=false](http://www.yoo-ulv.com/EMpO7STUBbGM4&hl=en&sa=X&ei=Pp2UUvPdF4bPhAfkvICQAw&ved=0CCoQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=Kottak%20in%20the%20united%20states%20identity%20emerges&f=false)

Kottak, Conrad Phillip (1996) *Mirror for Humanity*. McGraw-Hill.

Kristeva, Julia (1991) *Strangers to Ourselves*. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. Columbia University Press.

Lentin, Ronit (2007). Ireland: Racial state and crisis racism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(4): 610-627.

Levitt, Peggy (1998) Social Remittances: Migration Driven Local-Level Forms of Cultural Diffusion. *International Migration Review*, 32(4):926-948.

Levinas, Emmanuel (1989) *The Levinas Reader*. Seán Hand ed. Blackwell Publishers.

Malkki, Liisa (1992) National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity Among Scholars and Refugees. *Cultural Anthropology*, 7(1): 24-44.

Margolis, Maxine L. (1994) *Little Brazil. An Ethnography of Brazilians Immigrants in New York City*. Princeton University Press.

Marcus, George E. (2002) *The sentimental Citizen - Emotion in Democratic Politics*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Marx, Karl (2010 [1887]) *Capital*, Volume One. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Massey, Douglas and España, Felipe García (1987) The Social Process of International Migration. *Science, New Series*, 237(4816): 733-738.

Marcuse, Herbert (2002[1964]) *One-Dimensional Man*. London and New York: Routledge Classics.

Martes, Ana Cristina Braga (2000) *Brasileiros nos Estados Unidos: Um Estudo sobre Imigrantes em Massachusetts*. São Paulo: Editora Paz e Terra.

Massey, Douglas S., Joaquin Arango, Ali Koucouci, Adela Pellegrino, and J. Edward Taylor. (1998) *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Massey, Douglas and Zenteno, Rene (1999) The Dynamics of mass migration. *Social Sciences*, 96: 5328-5335.

Massey, Douglas S., Jorge Durand and Nolan J. Malone (2002) *Beyond Smoke and Mirrors. Mexican Immigration in an era of economic integration*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Maurer, Bill (2006) The Anthropology of Money. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 35: 15-36.

- Mauss, Marcel (2011 [1954]) *The Gift*. Martino Publishing.
- Mazzarella, William (2009) Affect: What is it Good for? In: *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*. Saurabh Dube ed. Pp. 291-309. Routledge.
- McGrath, Brian and Frank Murray (2009) 'Brazilian migrants in Ireland: Emergent themes from research and practice on the significance of social networks and social capital'. *Translocations: Migration and Social Change*, 5(1).
- McGrath, Brian (2010) 'Social capital in community, family, and work lives of Brazilian migrant parents in Ireland'. *Community, Work and Family*, 13(2): 147-165.
- Meu Bem, Meu Mal 1990-1991. Television soap opera, Rede Globo.
- Miles, Ann (2004) *From Cuenca to Queens: An Anthropological Story of Transnational Migration*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Mills, Mary Beth (1997) Contesting the Margins of Modernity: Women, Migration, and Consumption in Thailand. *American Ethnologist*, 24(1): 37-61.
- Mitsui, Hideko (2010) Longing for the Other: traitors' cosmopolitanism. *Social Anthropology*, 18(4): 410-416.
- Mullally, Siobhán (2007). Children, citizenship and constitutional change. In: *Immigration and Social Change in the Republic of Ireland*. Bryan Fanning ed. Manchester University Press.
- National Economic & Social Development Office (2006) *Migration Policy*. Dublin: National Economic and Social Council.
- Ong, Aihwa (2006) *Neoliberalism as exception. Mutations in citizenship and sovereignty*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Olsson, Erik and King, Russell (2008) Introduction: Diasporic Return. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 17(3): 255-261.
- Olsson, Erik (2008) From Diaspora with Dreams, Dreaming about Diaspora: Narratives on a Transnational Chilean Community. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 17(3): 362-384.
- O'Toole, Fintan (2010) *Enough is Enough. How to Build a New Republic*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Peebles, Gustav (2010) The Anthropology of Credit and Debt. *The Annual Review of Anthropology*, (39): 225-40.
- Pereira, Néli (2008) Crise obriga imigrantes brasileiros a abandonar 'sonho irlandês'. [Online] [Accessed 15 November 2013]. Available from: http://www.bbc.co.uk/portuguese/reporterbbc/story/2008/12/081218_brasileirosirlandanp.shtml

Portes, Alejandro and Julia Sensenbrenner (1993) Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on the Social Determinants of Economic Action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(6): 1320-1350.

Portes, Alejandro and Rubén G. Rumbaut (1996) *Immigrant America. A Portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rabanea, Zeynep Zileli (2013) The Brazilian soap opera: educating the masses. Today's Zaman. [Online] 8 September [Accessed 7 July 2014]. Available from: <http://www.todayszaman.com/news-325606-the-brazilian-soap-opera-educating-the-masses-by-zeynep-zileli-rabanea-.html>

Ramji, Hasmita (2006) British Indians 'Returning Home': An Exploration of Transnational Belongings. *Sociology*, 40(4): 645-662.

Rapport, Nigel (2006) Anthropology as Cosmopolitan Study. *Anthropology Today*, 22(1): 23-24.

Rapport, Nigel (2007a) An Outline for Cosmopolitan Study: Reclaiming the Human through Introspection. *Current Anthropology* 48(2): 257-283.

Rapport, Nigel (2007b) A cosmopolitan turn - or return? *Social Anthropology*, 15(2): 223-235.

Rapport, Nigel (2010) Cosmopolitanism and liberty. *Social Anthropology*, 18(4): 464-470.

Rapport, Nigel (2012) *Anyone, The Cosmopolitan Subject of Anthropology*. Berghahn Books.

Rapport, Nigel (2014) The Capacities of Anyone: Accommodating the Universal Human Subject as Value and in Space. In: *We the cosmopolitans: moral and existential conditions of being human*. Josephides, Lisette and Hall, Alexandra, eds. Pp. 48-67. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Redfield, Robert (Chair), Ralph Linton and Melville J. Herskovits (1936) Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 38: 149-152.

Ritzer, George (1996) *Sociological Theory. Fourth Edition*. Singapore: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Ritzer, George (1998) Introduction. In: Baudrillard, Jean (1998) *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. London: Sage Publications.

Rodrigues Guimarães, Ana Cristina (2007) Comerciantes de Bairro: seus Discursos, suas Práticas. *Antropologia Econômica e Ecológica*. VII RAM - UFRGS, Porto Alegre, Brasil. [Online]. [Accessed 28 October 2014]. Available from: http://nau.ufsc.br/files/2010/09/Ana-Cristina-Rodrigues-Guimarães_GT01.pdf

Rodrigues Guimarães, Ana Cristina (n.d.) O Lugar do Comércio: Um Estudo Antropológico sobre a Sociabilidade no Bairro. [Online]. [Accessed 29 October 2014].

Available from:

<http://www.abant.org.br/conteudo/000NOTICIAS/Premios/LeviStrauss/ana.pdf>

Rouse, Roger (1991) Mexican Migration and the Social Space of Postmodernism. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 1(1):8-23.

Sahlins, Marshall (1972) *Stone Age Economics*. Aldine-Atherton, Inc.

Sahlins, Marshall (2008) *The Western Illusion of Human Nature: With Reflections on the Long History of Hierarchy, Equality, and the Sublimation of Anarchy in the West, and Comparative Notes on Other Conceptions of the Human Condition*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

Sahlins, Marshall (2011a) What Kinship is (part one). *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, (N.S.)17: 2-19.

Sahlins, Marshall (2011b) What Kinship is (part two). *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, (N.S.)17:227-242.

Salih, Ruba (2001) Moroccan migrant women: transnationalism, nation-states and gender. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4): 655-671.

Santos, Ricardo and Leal, António Cezar (2010) Diagnóstico da qualidade ambiental na Estância Turística de Presidente Epitácio – São Paulo – Brasil. [Online]. [Accessed 20 November 2013]. Available from:

http://www.uc.pt/fluc/cegot/VISLAGF/actas/tema3/ricardo_santos

Sardinha, João (2008) “Even if the Only Thing for Me to Do Here Was to Milk Cows”: Portuguese Emigrant Descendant Returnees from Canada Narrate Pre-return Desires and Motivations. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 17(3): 316-339.

Saris, Jamie A. (2000) Producing persons and developing institutions in rural Ireland. *American Ethnologist*, 26(3): 690-710.

Sayad, Abdelmalek (1999) *The Suffering of the Immigrant*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Schiltz, Marc (2014) Cosmopolitanism as Welcoming the Other and Imperilling the Self: Ethics and Early Encounters between Lyons Missionaries and West African Rulers. In: *We the cosmopolitans: moral and existential conditions of being human*. Josephides, Lisette and Hall, Alexandra, eds. Pp. 111-134. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Sheringham, Olivia (2009) Ethnic Identity and Integration among Brazilians in Gort, Ireland. [Online]. [Accessed 15 November 2013]. Available from: <http://www.irlandeses.org/0903sheringham.htm>

Sichone, Owen B. (2008) Xenophobia and Xenophilia in South Africa: African Migrants in Cape Town. In: *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism*, Pina Werbner ed. Pp. 309-324. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Simmel, Georg (2011[1978]) *The Philosophy of Money*. Routledge Classics.

- Smith, Adam (2005[1902]) *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. An electronic Classics Series Production.
- Stade, Ronald (2007) A cosmopolitan turn - or return? *Social Anthropology*, 15(2): 223-235.
- Stade, Ronald (2014) Citizens of Everything: The Aporetics of Cosmopolitanism. In: *We the cosmopolitans: moral and existential conditions of being human*. Josephides, Lisette and Hall, Alexandra, eds. Pp. 29-47. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Strathern, Marilyn (2012) Gift money cannot buy. *Social Anthropology, Special Issue: the debt issue*, 20(4): 397-410.
- Svendsen, Lars (2008) *A Philosophy of Fear*. Reaktion Books Ltd.
- Taylor, Christopher C. (1992) *Milk, Money and Honey: Changing Concepts in Rwandan Healing*. London: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Throop, Jason (2003) Articulating Experience. *Anthropological Theory*, 3(2): 219-241.
- Titley, Gavan, Aphra Kerr and Rebecca King O’Riain (2010) *Broadcasting - in the new Ireland*. Maynooth: National University of Ireland Maynooth.
- Torresan, Angela (2011) Strange Bedfellows: Brazilian Immigrants Negotiating Friendship in Lisbon. *Ethnos*, 76(2): 233-253.
- Torresan, Angela (2012) A Middle Class Besieged: Brazilians’ Motives to Migrate. *The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology*, 17(1): 110-130.
- Traphagan, John W. (2000) The Liminal Family: Return Migration and Intergenerational Conflict in Japan. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 56(3): 365-385.
- Travassos, Luiz E. P. (2001) Impactos gerados pela UHE Porto Primavera sobre o meio físico e biótico de Campinal, Presidente Epitácio, SP. *Revista de Biologia e Ciências da Terra* 1(1).
- Tsuda, Takeyuki (2003) *Strangers in the Ethnic Homeland*. Columbia University Press.
- Walters, William (2010) Secure borders, safe haven, domopolitics. *Citizenship Studies*, 8(3): 237-260.
- Wardle, Huon (2010) Introduction. A cosmopolitan anthropology? *Social Anthropology*, 18(4): 381-388.
- Watson, James L. (1975) “Sterling Houses” and the economic effects of emigration. In: *Emigration and the Chinese Lineage*. The Mans in Hong Kong and London. University of California Press.
- Weiss, Brad (1997) Northwestern Tanzania on a Single Shilling: Sociality, Embodiment, Valuation. *Cultural Anthropology* 12(3): 335-361.

- Werbner, Pnina (1990) *The Migration Process: Capital, Gifts and Offerings among British Pakistanis*. Berg Publishers Limited.
- Werbner, Pnina (1998) Exoticising Citizenship: Anthropology and the new citizenship debate. *Canberra Anthropology*, 21(2): 1-27.
- Werbner, Pnina (1999) Global Pathway. Working class cosmopolitans and the creation of transnational ethnic worlds. *Social Anthropology*, 7(1): 17-35.
- Werbner, Pnina (2002) Reproducing the multicultural nation. *Anthropology Today*, 18(2): 3-4
- Werbner, Pnina (2006) Understanding Vernacular Cosmopolitanism. *Anthropology News*, May: 7-11.
- Werbner, Pnina (2008a) Introduction: Towards a New Cosmopolitan Anthropology. In: *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism*, Pnina Werbner ed. Pp. 1-32. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Werbner, Pnina (2008b) The Cosmopolitan encounter: Social Anthropology and the Kindness of Strangers. In: *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism*, Pnina Werbner ed. Pp. 47-68. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Werbner, Pnina (2011) Paradoxes of Postcolonial Vernacular Cosmopolitanism in South Asia and the Diaspora. In: *The Ashgate Research Companion to Cosmopolitanism*, eds. Maria Rovisco and Magdalena Nowicka. Pp. 107-124. Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Williams, Raymond (1977) *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford University Press.
- Žižek, Slavoj (2000) Melancholy and the Act. *Critical Inquiry*, 26(4): 657-681.
- Žižek, Slavoj, Coca-Cola and Kinder Eggs.[Online]. 18 November 2013. [Accessed 7 July 2014]. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vydwrn_TQow
- Žižek, Slavoj First as Tragedy, Then as Farce. [Online]. [Accessed 10 August 2014]. Available from: <http://www.thersa.org/events/video/archive/slavoj-zizek-first-as-tragedy,-then-as-farce>
- Zelizer, Viviana A. (1989) The Social Meaning of Money: “Special Monies”. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(2): 342-377.
- Zelizer, Viviana A. (1994) *The Social Meaning of Money: Pin money, paychecks, poor relief, & other currencies*. New York: BasicBooks.