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IMAGES OF VILLAGE AND MEGALOPOLIS: CONTRASTING MEXICAN CONSCIOUSNESS

JOSÉ DÁVILA AND MYRON ORLEANS

INTRODUCTION

Social change is a human universal, yet the migration from traditional social organization to the megalopolis of today's world results in personal displacements that are unprecedented. Even though analysts of the more developed societies have studied the changing life patterns and meaning systems of populations within traditional areas, there has been less focus on those sectors of changing societies that remain traditional yet impel migration due to economic factors. The subjective consequences for individuals of migration from stable, but economically depressed regions to the hypermodern world have not been sufficiently addressed. More importantly, understanding of the dual states of consciousness of those migrants as they experience and seek to meaningfully process cultural dislodgement has lagged far behind the demographic study of migration itself.

Traditional life patterns are usually analyzed in relation to villages or rural areas of developing societies. Traditional social action is defined as conduct oriented to the precedents established by prior generations. The nontraditional or modern sector is often represented by urban life patterns, conventionally termed the "megalopolis" in the current era. This mode is usually viewed in structural terms but it has also been conceptualized culturally. Analysis of the traditional/modern shift has most frequently focused on transitions, disjunctions or anomalies in the transformation of the social order on the macro level.

In this paper we seek to compare and contrast the distinctive modes of consciousness characteristic of the village community and the megalopolis as experienced and expressed by a small sample of individual migrants to Southern California from Mexico. We trace the migration experience from traditional to nontraditional life patterns within the subjective orientations of people who have only partially transitioned. We explore how they reconstruct and sustain for the interviewer their strong attachments to their cultural foundations while encountering and
dwelling within the new social order. We analyze the ways in which they strive to reconcile evocative images of their past with the raw experience of their immediate environment to make their life course decisions intelligible to themselves and others.

METHODS

Five subjects were interviewed (n=5). Three of them (subjects 1, 4, and 5) lived in the same house yet come from two different villages. All subjects were males ranging approximately between twenty-five and forty-two years of age. Three of them (subjects 2, 4, and 5) were never married without children. Subject 1 lived with his wife and two children in his house. His third child moved out of the house. Subject 2 was renting an apartment on his own in a different city and county in California. Subject 3 was renting an apartment with his brother in the same area where subjects 1, 4, and 5 lived. This subject (3) is separated with two children. Subjects 4, and 5 were renting a house on the second floor of the main house that is owned by subject 1.

All the subjects lived in villages for some years in Mexico (most of their childhood) and also have lived in the megalopolis of Southern California ranging from approximately six to twenty-two years. Two of the subjects fulfill the requirements to become naturalized American citizens, yet they have chosen not to do so or have not being able to... They argue that their lack of ability to learn English is the main reason why they have not been able to do it. As argued by Sosa, older Mexican Americans find it more difficult to learn English than the younger ones. One out of the five subjects already became a naturalized American Citizen (subject 2). This subject attended a community college and plans to continue his education until he receives an associate degree. The other subjects achieved between third and sixth grades in the villages that they come from. All the subjects are considered first generation migrants since they all emigrated from their places of origin. In other words, they were all born in Mexico of Mexican parents. Therefore, they do not have any direct family roots in the United States. All the subjects were employed at the time of the interviews. Considering their backgrounds and the number of years the subjects have been in the United States, they all appear to have a relatively stable employment pattern. Based on years of living at the same location, they all seem to be fairly stable individuals.

It is important to mention that the interviewer, the first author, knew all the subjects. One of them came from the same village as the inter-
viewer. Two more subjects came from a smaller village from the same region. Still another subject came from a different village that is farther from the researcher’s village. The last subject is from a village located in a different state of Mexico.

The interviews were conducted on different days due to the limitations of time and distance between the subjects and the researcher’s home (including the overlap of working and school schedules). All the interviews were conducted in Spanish and translated into English by the interviewer. Out of the five subjects, only one spoke limited English, just enough to hold a conversation, yet the interview was conducted in Spanish. The other subjects spoke only Spanish even though they understand some English.

**Results and Interpretations**

**Family and Gender Orientations**

One of the foundations of the traditional village orientation is its patriarchal family structure where the male exercises authority within the family. In a patriarchal family setting, assets and members are possessed by the elder male of the house as a form of private property. As expressed in one phrasing or another by all five subjects regarding their reconstruction of early family life, “the father is the person who makes all the decisions in the house and everyone else has to go by what he says.” “He is also the person responsible for the survival of the family.” In addition, “he is the protector and bread winner in the group. This gives him the control and responsibility that he has over the rest of the members of the family and control over material resources that they have” (subject 2). This is the kind of traditional family life style that the subjects recollected and retold regarding their formative years living in their home communities and is clearly differentiated from the megalopolis.

In this traditional, patriarchal setting, the family derived its social status from the head of the house, the male. In some other instances the family derived status from its heritage (from the family name). As expressed by subject 2, “people respect you if your father has a social position or if you come from a family known for having certain kinds of resources and status.” Nevertheless, all subjects agree, “The mother is the most important person of the family. It depends on the mother how the children grow up and socially develop.” Yet, women are accorded little autonomy or family power within the traditional division of labor between men and women.
A third characteristic of village societies may be the extended family structure. "In the village things are much easier because you know that, if you need, you have the support from your brothers, sisters, uncles, ants, parents, and grandparents. There is always someone to help you" (subject 1). The subjects reported feeling more confident and secure in knowing that supplementary kinship based resources were available for use if the need arose.

Things are different for the subjects in the megalopolis. Even though women do not have recognition as the head of the family, unless they are single parents, they have a say in family matters. Women or children are not seen as private property any more. As expressed by subject 3, "if women do not like what is happening on the family they just take everything, including the kids, and leave you on your own. That is what happened to me; she just left." In this context, men may still be the source of socio-economic status, yet women's economic contributions are accepted while their growing autonomy is sometimes feared and even resented.

The second income increases the family's economic status, which is accompanied, in some cases, by a higher social status of the family. In many instances women enter the labor force, yet are still required to do the house chores and take care of the children without recognition or economic remuneration. "My wife helped me a lot [when she was working] and we were able to obtain additional things to improve our life style" (subject 1). But women's financial contribution is frequently perceived as marginal and is rationalized away.

Another characteristic of the megalopolis is the nuclear family arrangement. This family setting consists of the parents and children only. "Here [megalopolis] you have to do it on your own. Your relatives cannot help you because they need help themselves" (subject 1). On some occasions, "you cannot even visit them because you do not even find them. They are too busy" (subject 1).

Meanings of Time

Life in the megalopolis and life in the village are structured around certain daily routines that are circumscribed by temporal constructs. In the two environments "people get up, get ready to go to work, go to work, come back home, and enjoy some spare time left during the day or evening" (subject 2). Even though these everyday actions seem similar, they are clearly distinguishable from each other in relation to environmental patterns and subjective meanings.
The physical settings of the villages do not have most, if not all, of the urban, technological infrastructure that is assumed in the megalopolis. In addition, the physical layout of the houses is quite dissimilar. This variation of context strongly impacts the construction of time in the two worlds. The lower level of infrastructure in the village mandates higher frequency and intensity face-to-face interaction. These social connections are the product of the everyday interactions among the same people and reinforce the context that spawns them. On the other hand, in the view of the subjects the megalopolis infrastructure promotes a less interactive style of life such that urbanites "do not have the social connections and interactions that those people in the villages do" (subject 2). Furthermore, people in the megalopolis, focused as they are on commuting and mediated communication "do not have the time to spend on socializing" (subject 2).

By the same token, the two worlds are thought to differ in terms of the meanings that guide people’s conduct in everyday life. Certainly, the meaning of time is differentiated. In the megalopolis "time is money" (subject 1). In other words, time guides people’s actions from the start of the day to its end. In this environment the clock guides people. All starts when the “alarm wakes you up.” In many instances, people do not even want to get up yet, “they have to do it because they might be late to work” (subject 1). “We have to be at work at a certain time even if we do not want to.” Then, the actions that follow are similarly. “People need to do action ‘A’ at certain time in order to be able to do action ‘B’ on time...in order to be able to do action ‘C’ and so on” (subject 1). Again, subject 1 thinks that in the megalopolis “Time frames people’s activities in every sense of the word.” In Zerubavel’s terms, the world has certain regularity. As a consequence, situations or events have their own sequential structure that “tells us in what order they take place.” He further argues that Western civilizations standardize events by scheduling them, which produces a sense of time as schedule. This rhythmicity is socially created, artificial, mechanical time or a kind of periodicity dictated by the clock, the calendar, and the schedule.

In the village, people “get up whenever they want.” In general, people get up “when the body is totally rested.” This usually happens when the “daylight comes” (“cuando amanece”), as recalled by subject 1. This process is accompanied by the “melodic noise from birds, roosters, and any other animal in the village.” In this environment, people are “happy to get up and enjoy nature.” “People do not have to be system
atic.” In other words, “they do not have to do action ‘A’ in order to be able to do action ‘B’ on time or do action ‘B’ in order to do action ‘C’ on time.” “You finish your job whenever you finish it” (subject 1). “There is not an urgency to do things at certain times. It is more important to dedicate some time to socialize than to work” (subject 1). As Zerubavel argues, in non-Western civilizations, events and activities are temporally located in a spontaneous manner giving a sense of time as natural or casual. In these kinds of civilizations (non-Western), human activity regulates the calendar or schedule while the opposite is true in Western civilizations. In non-Western civilizations, social life functions in accord with organic and functional periodicity dictated by nature, not by the clock or the schedule.

In essence, time in the village is experienced as a natural phenomenon. First of all, most villagers did not even have clocks or watches. They were guided by “the position of the sun so the time at certain moments was estimated” (subject 3). Secondly, people did not have to accomplish activities at specific times. Usually “people do what they can or think is more important for them and for others. They usually start doing one thing but do not finish it because they feel that something else is more important” (subject 3). “When they have time again, they continue where they left the last time that they were doing the specific task.” Again “you finish whenever you finish” (subject 1). This is the case even when people work for someone else. Subjects 1 and 2 agree that the boss, if you happen to have one, never checks whether you have finished a job by a certain time. In most instances, however, people do not work for others. They work for themselves producing what they need just to survive for the whole year or season. In other words, people are not forced into certain socially created frames such as the week in Zerubavel’s analysis.

In some villages agricultural production is based on irrigation systems, but in most they depend mainly on natural forces, such as rainfall. Relying on nature, villagers tend to use natural events to structure their experience of time. Subject 2 reports that, “most people have a portion of land that they cultivate to feed or sustain their families for the whole year or season.” This kind of property is called “ejido” which consists of land given to the peasants by the government. In some instances the land is communal property. In other words, a “group of people work all the land available and the crops or production such as beans, corn, squash, and other products are distributed equally to all and each of the families based on their needs and work invested” (subject 2). This tends
to foster a collective sense of time as a property of the community rather than as an individual phenomenon.

Subjectivity of Everyday Life

The subjects experience the internal dimension of everyday life in the village and megalopolis differently. As expressed by subject 1, “there [in the village], people are free because they can do whatever they want whenever they want to. Here [in the megalopolis], people become slaves because you can not do anything without others telling you what you can or cannot do, specially the government.” De Certeau wrote of this when he suggested that people in the city participate in a complex of interrelated processes that they are not able to comprehend or alter. The subjects experience far greater external constraint on their lives that remain impenetrable. As a result the subjects expressed feelings of estrangement. Many people just go “from home to work and from work to home, that is all.” “You cannot go anywhere else because you are exposed to so many dangers” (subject 1). “Individuals do not really have a choice on deciding what, where, and when to do things” (subject 3). Sanchez suggests that these feelings have been prevalent among Mexican Americans since the beginning of the century and may have impacted their mode of adaptation.

Contrastively, in the village “people decide on an individual basis when to start working, when to stop, and what work to do then or next. I remember that there were some days when I did not feel like going to work and I just did not go” (subject 1). They also decide “where to go and when” (subject 1). Similarly, the subjects recall that villagers do not have an obligation to act systematically. “If one day you are supposed to go to the field and decide that you do not want to, you just do not go. If at that moment you decide to go to a different place you just go” (Subject 1). “In the village you do not have a set schedule, you basically make your own and can change it at any time you decide to. If you need to do specific job, you can do it at any time you want to” (subject 3). Once again, this expresses the recollected significance of personal and culturally based preferences in the scheduling of human activity in non-Western civilizations (Zerubavel, 1981).

According to Thomas and Znaniecki when migrants settle in a new society, they are frequently not provided with social institutions to facilitate the transition process. When peasants leave their places of origin and arrive in the megalopolis, their life patterns are severely disrupted. Their personal dislocation may be experienced as a sense of
spiritual loss. To a degree, subjects feel that "some people seek spiritual fulfillment through religion." Therefore, religion and religious conversion may serve the specific function of helping people deal with the change and cultural shock.15 "You feel good when you go to church and see other people that look like you and have probably gone through similar experiences [migrant]. You identify with them. They give you encouragement to continue forward with some hope in the future" (subject 1). But in other modes of response, some "people try to find a way out by doing drugs or drinking alcohol. Others just go back home to the places where they come from" (subject 4).

Another important factor in marking the differences between the village and megalopolis life is how people seek recognition and respect, how they acquire community status and thereby self-esteem. In the village, the differences in social class are not as accentuated as they are in the megalopolis. Generally, people are poor and live off their own crops. In these cases males acquire self-esteem by demonstrating personal attributes, skills, or abilities. For instance, "those individuals who are able to produce the bigger and better crops gain some prestige, respect, and self-esteem" (subject 2). This gain is accompanied by some power over others and, at the same time, by greater respect. In the same way, "those who are able to maintain their animals such as horses (if they have any) in better shape than the rest of the community through their hard work are also respected and recognized by others" (subject 2). Even though "some individuals have some power because they have more than the rest, the biggest things...are the personal abilities and skills of the people themselves" (subject 3).

Another way of getting this kind of recognition is the personal charisma of people, "people make themselves to be liked by the kinds of things that they do and say to others" (subject 5). As Cintron puts it, "people try to create respect under conditions of little or no respect".16 In some instances physical violence is a factor in gaining recognition in this environment. "That person who does not care about killing others is feared, but also respected. So, people do not mess with him at all" (subject 3). This mode of conduct is not only used in the village setting but has been noted as well in the megalopolis where it has been employed for similar purposes. Intimidation through physical posturing has been noted regarding gang behavior in the megalopolis.17 In other words, individuals use these behavioral displays to gain power over certain areas or persons without actually engaging in violent acts.

In the megalopolis, additional means become available for gaining
recognition and respect. For instance, joking contests especially among males to determine who has the sharpest phrase are quite widespread. The man with the most pointed words gains respect and status in the eyes of others for his claims to sexual prowess and alcoholic tolerance.18 (1997).

Others generate respect by showing the most extravagant car in town or demonstrating possession of other glitzy material assets.19 Thus, people in the megalopolis may try to gain self-esteem, respect, and recognition, or power by exhibiting material assets. They seek to do this, “by driving the most fancy and expensive car, by having the more expensive house, and by having the most popular or beautiful girl” (subject 2). Those more assimilated to the American culture carry on these demonstrations in ways that are related to their image of megalopolis values.

Social Interactions

The social interactions of the individuals in the village and megalopolis are oriented to the meanings of each set of interactions. In both settings they tried to appear as worthy people. Even though in both worlds people try to present the best impression of themselves to others, it seemed that the perception of others is considered more important in the village than in the megalopolis because of the regularity of co-presence. “It is important that you treat people with the respect that they deserve because you find yourself dealing with them all the time” (subject 4). In here [megalopolis], “you see people once and then do not see them for a long time” (subject 5).

Interaction patterns in the two settings are categorically different. In the village, all people know each other fairly well. It is claimed that people help and trust each other because they interact collaboratively with each other in a daily basis. In the village, “people feel a sense of togetherness that produces other social and psychological processes”.20 For instance, people believe that “others are not going to harm them or abuse any person due to any disadvantageous circumstance that they might find themselves in” (subject 5). On the contrary, as expressed by subject 5, they believe that “someone is going to help them if they happen to need any help” (“la gente te saca de apuros”). Of course, this trust is built through repetitive positive valued behavior of individuals and families over time. “People know that others in the village are not going to harm them without reason” (subject 4) because they feel familiar and rooted. Besides that, “they might need some help themselves in the future and some people would be willing to help them too” (subject 4).
So, they are impelled to face any circumstance with a positive attitude and build upon that essential trust.

In the megalopolis subjects report distinctive forms of sociation. In some instances “people do not even know their next door neighbors at all.” It is often the case that “people [neighbors] just say “hi” to each other” (subject 2). Instead of trusting in people, “there is a sense of distrust” (subject 4). This is partly due to the fact that “you do not know what kind of person you are dealing with” (subject 1). People also know that “they [the neighbors] can leave any minute without leaving any clue at all as of where they could ever be found” (subject 5). In most instances, as expressed by subject 4, “people do not see those neighbors that leave ever again” (“nunca los vuelves a ver”). Interestingly, in the megalopolis some reports suggest, “people do not even trust their own extended or nuclear family members” (subject 2). There is a belief that some “people in the megalopolis are just trying to get as much as they can for themselves from anybody or anywhere that they can” (subject 3). In other words, “people do not have a sense of community in the megalopolis as they do have it in the village” (subject 1). There is a belief among the peasant migrants, such as subject 3, that, “the US divides and destroys families.”

Socioeconomic Factors

Even though some migrants hold some negative beliefs about the megalopolis, they continue to emigrate. A principal force is the financial pressure they experience in their places of origin. They see that some people who come back to Mexico display their money or other material assets and they also want to do the same. As expressed by subject 3, “people go back with pick up trucks or nice cars and spend a lot of money with their friends, so you want to be able to do the same thing. Besides that, they tell you that people start accumulating lots of money as soon as they arrive to the United States. They also tell you that it is very easy to do it. So, you get tempted and make plans to give it a try.” In addition, the megalopolis gives many commodities to people that are not available in the village setting. Migrants become used to these consumer items very easily. “I went back for a couple of weeks determined to stay there for a while, but after a week or so I was missing my hamburgers so bad that I decided to come [to the megalopolis] within days. The first thing that I did upon my arrival to the United States was to go to a fast food restaurant to have my hamburger. We just get used to this life style too fast. I know that I would have never had the things that I
Many migrants experience at one time or another certain kinds of discrimination, prejudice, and injustice directed against themselves and others. They start to see the differences between the “socioeconomic class divisions as well” (subject 2). These factors contribute to the negative beliefs that migrants (especially peasants) hold about the megalopolis, yet they are willing to stay. All the subjects mentioned poverty and the aspiration to have a better life style as the most important reasons for migrating. “I remember when my mother just to cut one tortilla in four pieces in order to be able to give one piece to each of the family members for dinner. When I first came [to the megalopolis of Southern California] I felt how hard life was far from home, but I never thought of going back. I did not want to be seen as a failure (‘bracero fracazado’) or be in the same poverty that I was getting away from” (subject 1). Some of these people (such as subject 1) come with the belief that “those who have assets and resources will help those who do not” but subjects did not report actually observing this in action.

The primacy of the communal pattern of life in the village is rooted in reciprocities of behavior; the subjects recall that they responded to other villagers in terms of their fair exchanges. They do not recall considering economic actions in light of issues of injustice, inequality, or human rights. Economic activities seemed clearly defined and “normal” (subjects 1, 3, 4, and 5). These subjects recall that villagers engaged in exchanges in accordance with traditional cultural norms.

Once the subjects gained a sense of the distinct life style of the megalopolis and learned to accommodate, they perceived benefits in the economic opportunities afforded in the new environment. Even when the conditions were not fully desirable in their eyes, the subjects interpreted them as advantageous: “Even though I see some injustices now and then against people like me or even against myself, I feel as if the rewards are worth the sacrifice. This is one of the reasons why I do not plan to go back at least for many years. Besides that, all my kids have been growing up in this kind of life style and do not want to go and live in Mexico” (subject 1).

**Government**

As mentioned, subjects report that their lives were essentially guided by long-standing customary practices in the village. Since villagers comply with the unwritten rules and roles that are deeply etched in consciousness and lived barely above subsistence, only minimal govern-
ment involvement was experienced in their daily lives. The villagers did not have a sense of government in the same sense as it was felt more recently in their lives in the megalopolis. Subjects reported that in the village frequently one person hesitantly served as informal representative of the group, yet “this person cannot make most, if not all, decisions without first consulting with the other members of the group. In fact, “mostly they do not hold elections nor do they participate in governmental activities” (subject 4).

Of course, their concept of government changed when these peasants moved to the megalopolis since “government is in their lives in so many different ways. There are so many laws and rules that people need, and have to follow, in order to live in this environment” (subject 5). Peasant migrants may feel estranged from these rules because “they are not used to live under so many restrictions imposed on them by other people [government],” yet most comply in order to socially function in the megalopolis. Some subjects believe that the “role of government [in the megalopolis] is to help those in need” (subject 3). The subjects were, thus, willing to comply with restrictions even when disagreeing with them in anticipation of assistance when needed. Moreover, while the authorities in the megalopolis may appear foreboding upon arrival, the relative neutrality and apparent benignity of government representatives in the social service/educational spheres foster a more accepting view of government among the subjects, particularly those who have the longest history of migration.

Discussion

The interviews revealed a set of sharply differentiated orientations related to the two life contexts of the village and megalopolis. Peasants from the villages who migrate to the megalopolis experience themselves as having gone through remarkable and irreversible subjective changes, while at the same time retaining elements of their prior modes of consciousness.

In the village as well as in the megalopolis, people abide by certain routines. These daily routines are guided according to the concept of time and duty in the different settings. The subjects felt freer responding to the rhythms of village life than to the rationalized structure of the megalopolis. Furthermore, they recalled a sense of community and togetherness in the village while they experience a sense of loneliness and separateness in the megalopolis. In addition, there was a feeling of trust in people in the village while the megalopolis was characterized by
suspicion. The subjects claimed that material commodities were less valued in the village while the spiritual aspects of life were more emphasized. On the other hand, people in the megalopolis were perceived as valuing and focusing upon material commodities such as cars, remote controls, automatic doors, and elevators more than spiritual needs (particularly, subjects 1 and 3). Since nearly all people are poor in the village, the subjects recall a minimal concern for matters of distributional justice.

The subjects stated that life in the village is governed so much by tradition that they did not recollect questioning or challenging customary practices. The primacy of the family and the essentiality and beneficence of the mother image capture the subjects’ craving for village life. The subjects see the mother as the ‘maximum’ asset that one can have, yet they do not see the repressive and subordinated conditions of women and mothers. Indeed, living in the megalopolis, some of the subjects continue to manage their lives according to the traditional patriarchal pattern within the constraints of the laws of the megalopolis. Thus, they seek to perpetuate the symbolism of the mother figure while encasing the roles of women within the confines of traditionalism. The viability of this tendency remains, of course, an important question.

The subjects tried to appear as individuals worthy of respect and status in both contexts. Through their presentations, discourses and activities they strove to achieve standing in their communities. In the village, criteria for social evaluations were characterized as being more personal than in the megalopolis where more extrinsic factors were used. While distinct, some seepage between criteria was detected in the process of producing status communities. As distinct as the worlds were in the minds of the subjects, in this arena and in others, some cultural crossover modes of thinking were apparent yielding dilemmas of self and social identity for the subjects. Infusing village-based criteria into their evaluative thinking softened their despair at the acquisitive, achievement-oriented criteria of the megalopolis allowing them to feel worthy despite their humble circumstances.

We must understand the interview data in this study as reconstructions of village life that uphold the subjects’ value concepts of desirable characteristics. The subjects viewed the qualities of their backgrounds in a selective and highly favorable light. Their perceptions of the life conditions of the megalopolis were fraught with negativities. Nevertheless, all the subjects have decided to remain in the megalopo-
This paradoxical mode of split consciousness required that the subjects produce for themselves a coherent interpretation of their life course. How could they reconcile their nostalgic imagery in the face of a culturally harsh immediate environment and persevere in place? It is through this nostalgic imagery that they uphold their dignity and sense of self while coping with the stresses, challenges and degradations of their current life circumstances. The benefit of their particular retrospective perspective for the subjects is that it permits them to distance themselves from the present and endure their yearning for a lost existence.

Whether the subjects’ reconstructions of village life or their analyses of megalopolis are correct is beside the point. Even though these subjects have been away from village life for many years, they did not question their own recollections assuming them to be objectively true, rather than partialized imagery, shaded visions and vague memories. Their apparently negative view of the megalopolis is only somewhat tempered by their willingness to suffer spiritual loss for material gain. The key point is that through their reconstructions the subjects navigated between the two worlds of consciousness. The differences between the village and megalopolis are significant and even dramatic in their impact on the subjects’ being, yet the thematic efforts of the migrants to humanize themselves and their worlds override the dissimilarities that are so apparent. Thus, the visualizing and discourses move the subjects toward an uneasy reconciliation of the two worlds of village and megalopolis and lend some coherence to their lives.
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