

PRODUCTIVE AND ECONOMIC CHANGES AND TERRITORIAL RECONFIGURATION IN BRAZIL AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY¹

MUDANÇAS PRODUTIVAS E ECONÔMICAS E RECONFIGURAÇÃO TERRITORIAL NO BRASIL NO INÍCIO DO SÉCULO XXI

CARLOS ANTÔNIO BRANDÃO*

* Instituto de Pesquisa e Planejamento Urbano e Regional da Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.

ABSTRACT: The objective of this article is to identify the most remarkable changes and transformations in the productive structures that have impacted the Brazilian territory in the recent period (2003-2018). It proposes and analyzes a typology of the investments made in these 15 years and their significant space repercussions. In the period of growth (2004-2014), public and private investments were oriented: by the inertial-coastal pattern, by their punctual nature of enclaves, by the expansion of commodity production, by infrastructure and by social spending. This pattern of growth has been interrupted since 2015 with likely significant territorial impacts underway.

KEY WORDS: Brazil; productive and territorial restructuring; productive investments; regional worlds; territorial reconfiguration;

RESUMO: O objetivo deste artigo é identificar as permanências e transformações mais salientes nas estruturas produtivas que impactaram o território brasileiro no período recente (2003-2018). Propõe-se e analisa-se a tipologia dos investimentos realizados nos últimos 15 anos e seus rebatimentos espaciais. No período de crescimento 2004-2014, ocorreram inversões públicas e privadas que se orientaram pelo padrão inercial-litorâneo, por sua natureza pontual de enclaves, pela expansão da produção de commodities, pela infraestrutura e pelos gastos sociais. Esse padrão de crescimento foi interrompido em 2015, com a probabilidade de importantes impactos territoriais.

PALAVRAS - CHAVE: Brasil; reestruturação produtiva e territorial; investimentos produtivos; mundos regionais; reconfiguração territorial

¹ I am grateful for the essential suggestions made by two anonymous reviewers, who have contributed significantly to the present version. I thank the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) for the support of my research. This article is indebted to numerous colleagues with whom I discussed the ideas synthesized here, which were decisive for me to arrive at this version. The remaining shortcomings of it, however, are mine.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22296/2317-1529.2019v21n2p258>

INTRODUCTION

The present text aims to make a summarized analysis of the most outstanding changes in Brazilian territorial dynamics in recent times, as well as about regions that did not face any transformation in the same period. It was done by identifying the main techno-economic and territorial vectors of the last decades, with emphasis on the period between 2003 and 2018.

The theoretical and analytical references are the well-known and extensive literature about the Brazilian territorial transformations influenced by the techno-productive and socioeconomic changes faced by the Brazilian peripheral capitalism throughout history, mainly the work by authors guided by the social Latin-American historical-structuralist critical concepts. These authors aimed at applying such theoretical background to urban and regional studies. Some of the masterpieces published by this theoretical current were written by OLIVEIRA (1977); CANO (1985); DINIZ (1993); GUIMARÃES NETO (1997); BACELAR DE ARAÚJO (1999); PACHECO (1998) and SANTOS and SILVEIRA (2001).

Such “scientific patrimony accumulated/developed in our continent” (BRANDÃO, 2018) lay on the historical-structural, an original and creative method developed in Latin America and applied in order to assess particular situations that have associated industrialization and underdevelopment throughout the history of capitalism. This patrimony introduces the following strength-ideas and key-concepts: constitutive existence of an Interregional Division of Labor (space and territory), inherent presence of remarkable Structural Heterogeneities (social, productive, cultural and regional) in peripheral-dependent situations that would be in compliance with quite particular Development Styles, need of analyzing and understanding quite strict inter-scale hierarchies and central-peripheral relations, among others. Moreover, these authors have developed theories based on dynamic concepts of a macroeconomic environment that comprises and articulates a micro-economy that is crossed by competition patterns ruled by oligopolies formed by the State and by a fundamental macrostructure. Such theoretical basis herein addressed as the Latin-American critical historical-cultural thinking has substantiated the present article, which used a qualitative exploratory method to formulate hypotheses and diagnostics about specific processes by assessing their multiple dimensions.

The thesis starts from the hypothesis that it would be possible to filter, organize and systematize the productive and socio-cultural changes, and their most outstanding socio-territorial impacts, by identifying the determining, conditioning and supporting factors of the approached processes. The question boosting this critical thinking lies on knowing whether the dynamics of a particular growth cycle is followed, or not, by changes in productive, occupational, ownership and income distribution structures, among others. The most general theory states that “growth without structural change” does not lead to, or cannot be associated with, a real, sustainable and long-lasting development process. Two of these structures are central, and the main question about development depends on questioning and qualifying the existence, or not, of proper articulations among productive, income and richness distribution structures.

Based on the theories as mentioned above, each conjuncture cycle would demand the investigation of essential relationships between production structure and income distribution within the structural context of “an accumulation process whose

inter-sector relationships are fundamental” (TAVARES, 1975, p.36). The aim is to understand the “endogenous relationship”, i.e., “how the historical accumulation process in an economic system enables changes in the accumulation pattern itself; it is worth assessing the relationships between productive structure and social income distribution” (TAVARES, 1975, p.37).

Accordingly, the investment would be the key variable to assess the rhythm, cadence, synchrony and unbalance in the explained regions. All these features must be analyzed based on public and private investments of multiple origins, as well as in their specific time and space, to better assess the capital accumulation process and the dynamics of capitalist development.

Aníbal Pinto (1976b) precisely distinguished the nature of public investments from the private ones when he stated that “the public investment is not subjected to conditions that regulate private investments. As often said: it is ‘autonomous’. Consequently, at first, it is not even subjected to income distribution, to demand composition or, to a certain extent, to restrictions imposed by market dimensions. It happens because public investors can count on more extended evaluation periods than private ones, as well as disregard profitability as a decisive criterion” (PINTO, 1976b, p. 98).

One of the goals in the current article was to develop a heuristic resource, a typology capable of allowing future comparative studies involving different socioeconomic power and factors, and various territories influenced by public and private investments of multiple nature.

The aim was to absorb specific processes, some of them yet in course, by following the analytical view of the political economy of development. These processes must be assessed based on the Brazilian historical-structural context by synthesizing disruptions and continuities.

The most extended continuity in Brazilian history is marked by inequality and destitution, on the one hand, and by diversity and heterogeneity, on the other. All these marks were often present in the formation and development of Brazil’s territorial dimensions. Despite the potential of the remaining unequal development in Brazil, even with the awareness of the aforementioned structural features, it was possible drawing the overall lines of the attempt to synthesize these periods into four milestones: 1933/1982, 1983/1994, 1995/2002 and 2003/2015.

A complex incorporation and forward flight scheme were structured between 1933 and 1982, and it encompassed potent inter-regional and intra-regional articulation connections. Localized projects and expansion coalitions involving a long-lasting developmental convention were solidified in the most different regional spaces during these “fifty glorious” years. The country got economically integrated throughout these five decades, but this integration was not only a set of processes operated by the trading power of capitalist relations and democratic processes. Not just the coercive power of competition was in action, but also the military and political-institutional coercion, which was often conservative and played a decisive role in the imposed coherence that has structured the Brazilian national scale.

The credit crunch era (1982/83), a time marked by the debt and fiscal-financial crises, when the State lost its coordination ability, was characterized by the ultimate exposition of the peripheral and submissive character of Latin-American capitalism and its structural vulnerabilities, such as resource transference to international markets

and the disruption of articulated state-action mechanisms. Frequent and inconsistent mini-cycles of growth were established; they were followed by public-patrimony dispossession and by the rearrangement and crystallization of commitments set by a wide range of conservative alliances until 1994.

By walking forward in time, one finds three Neoliberal Rounds that correspond to the administrations of presidents Fernando Henrique Cardoso (FHC) - 1995/2002 -, Lula-Dilma - 2003/2015 -, and Temer - 2016/2018. The Washington Consensus marked the conservative 1990s; during this decade the country was ruled by FHC (1995/2002), who put emblematic Roll-Back strategies in place (BRENNER et al., 2012). These strategies were an offensive attack elaborated to disrupt the public institutions that regulated the market at this point, and their power was reduced to give more freedom of action to the market. It was the time of privatizations and economy internationalization, of destroying job positions and of guaranteeing rights, as well as of strong repression to social movements.

Lula and Dilma's administrations (2003/2015) were featured by broad regulatory restructuring implemented through Roll-Out rounds based on re-regulations, initiatives in poverty alleviation and community empowerment. They opposed previous governance methods and created defense refuges to fit different markets, without losing track of social rights. After Dilma's impeachment, the neoliberal processes expanded and grew roots; therefore, one more round freed the market to work without peas. This period opened room for institutional deconstruction and attacks against democracy.

It is essential assessing the main transformations observed in the productive structures that had considerable impacts on the Brazilian territory from 2003 to 2018 since it meant twenty years of productive regression and retroactive specializations. Therefore, the present study aimed to propose and analyze a typology of investments made during these fifteen years and their spatial refutations. There were public and private investments guided by inertial-coastal patterns between 2004 and 2014, given the punctual nature of enclaves, and the expanded production of commodities, infrastructure and social expenses. This growth pattern was broken in 2015, and such interruption may still have destructive and unorganized effects on the Brazilian territory.

To allow a precise analysis, the herein addressed main heterodox argument aims at elaborating a heuristic resource based on a typology supported by five investment types and by five types of prevalent territories influenced and (re) defined in separate ways.

- Type I Territories – defined by the inertial force of agglomeration and urbanization factors (coast, metropolitan regions - MR - and state capitals), and by the productive location advantages of urban networks in the Southern and Southeastern regions;
- Type II Territories – defined by the implementation of punctual investments that tend to create isolated or enclaved poles featured by low induction in their surroundings and hinterlands;
- Type III Territories – defined by the world demand for commodities;
- Type IV Territories – defined by investments made, or guided, by the State in transportation and power-generation infrastructures, etc.;
- Type V Territories – defined by the implementation of social policies, by

improvements in living conditions and social devices, and by the expansion of the domestic consumption market.

The article is structured as follows: after a briefing on the techno-productive and territorial changes observed in the XX century, it shows the analysis applied to the transformations caused by the economic growth in the early 2000s and to the spatial effects from the interruption of the transformation process from 2015 on.

BACKGROUD OF THE MAIN DYNAMICS OF TERRITORIAL CHANGES OBSERVED IN BRASIL

Entirely peculiar historical processes have left a remarkable heritage whose content comprises the wide variety of trajectories observed in the five Brazilian macro-regions. Despite the robust inter-regional integration process set between markets, it is possible stating that, besides the Southeast-South region, there are “three different regional worlds” consolidated in the country: Amazon, Northeast and Midwest. Despite the huge differences among these “three worlds”, yet, it is likely finding quite specific unequal development processes in all known dimensions. One can highlight a wide variety of Brazilian internal inequalities and injustices, in any of the macro-regions, these differences amalgamate and overlap social iniquities associated with access to rights, heterogeneous economic structures, etc., as well as quite vigorous diversified environmental, social, cultural varieties, among others.

Such long-lasting and complex processes were marked by economic dynamism, multiple effects and income and richness acceleration, but also by impairments towards society, such as social reforms, distribution of income, qualification through property and access to rights. The “national economic system” designed in the XX century reached high degrees of commercial and production integration, it was a matrix network of intra- and inter-economic sectors that have spread across the country unequally and selectively.

A complex scheme of central-peripheral and hierarchical relationships moored in a long trajectory of inter- and intra-regional commercial and industrial articulations was consolidated during the period as mentioned earlier. These relationships connected all parts of the country through trading during the “fifty glorious years” of growth (1933/1982). This period was guided by Fordism, and by its techno-economic paradigm, although such concepts were masked by a peripheral and dependent underdeveloped capitalism. It was from the 1960s on that the most systematic actions taken by the State, mainly in national peripheries, reinforced the role played by the State as the direct and structuring investor in the national territory.

Back in the 1980s, after the Latin-American debt crisis, a half century of insertion in the international post-war growth process collapsed. Therefore, three shocks had met and articulated: sudden suspension of foreign credit, deterioration of exchange ratios and increased costs with debt renegotiation. These factors broadened the external liabilities, the adjustments in the public sector and the disruption of instruments used for State actions. The public heritage, which was built through a half-century of political struggle, was destroyed and critics towards the “Intervenor” State came up.

If one takes into account the spatial dimension of underdevelopment processes observed in Brazil, it is possible saying that the period as mentioned above brought significant changes to the articulation of regional diversities in the country. Based on external adjustment and on the efforts to boost the exports, as well as on privatization processes, the historical heritage of each macro-region reveals the denial towards the construction of relatively complementary productive structures. Such denial is evidenced by the State's low support to open room for international markets in the national economy.

The early 1980s revealed the recrudescence of old issues and the historical recurrences of social productions in the country, which is featured as a locked and inconclusive nation. There were remarkable updates in structural productive, social and regional heterogeneity; in internal domination covenants, and their association with foreign countries, in the systemic external vulnerability associated with population exclusion and marginalization from revenues resulting from material progress.

Thus, 1988 can be paradoxically seen as a milestone either due to the Federal Constitution – which established important social rights –, to the hegemonic implementation of practices and narratives or to the reconstruction of instruments and neoliberal provisions. The generalized loss of economic dynamism and the process of broadening socioeconomic unevenness among the regions in Brazil in the 1990s were determined by the international macro-economic environment, by mistaken options of economic policies, and by losses in the systemic and organic quality of actions taken by the State. All these factors have resulted in unbalance between public and private investments.

The neoliberal round (PECK, 2010; BRENNER et al., 2012) deepened the crisis and led to the financialization of decision-making environments due to the conservative management of macro-economic policies that have negatively affected the conventions and the sense of reliability. Accordingly, “decision about investments in new production facilities – greenfield – are considered riskier due to a wide range of options to invest in financial assets (treasury bonds, foreign exchange securities, derivatives, etc.) that generate short- and mid-term revenues” (MONTEIRO NETO, 2005, p. 48).

During Fernando Henrique Cardoso's administration (1995/2002), the commercial and financial opening processes and the disruption of state-intervention abilities delivered the public patrimony to “private investors”; the internationalization of most national production poles ended up, in 1999, in the implementation of the macroeconomic tripod: inflation targets, floating exchange rates and primary fiscal surplus targets – this process has lasted seventeen years. The tripod substantiated the maintenance of an orthodox policy that imposed low growth rates to the country.

Among other factors, the ones mentioned above were responsible for substantial changes in the relationships of, and between, Brazilian regions. Thus, at some extent, transformations in the Brazilian regional landscape throughout the 1990s were more effective to boost the evolution and deconstruction of differentiated regional impacts caused by the economic crisis and by conservative options available for macro-economic policies, than the restructuring processes.

Each region had different sensitivity to the commercial opening, to microeconomic determinants of business reorganizations, to the deterioration of economic infrastructure and the disruption of the public sector in the three levels of

the federal government. Inter- and intra-regional heterogeneities, mainly the intra-regional ones, grew considerably. Productivity islands and competitiveness poles were broadened, as well as the production and exports of some products that demand high and vulnerable regressive specialization, mainly commodities.

The historical macro-structural features of multiple Brazilian regional and social inequalities observed in the last decade of the XX century got worse due to neoliberal actions taken to conduct the economic policies put in practice. The State lost its power to coordinate the structuring process set to guide and promote fronts of attractive expansions. This process made it much harder to fit and converge either great and dispersive interests. The lost ability of the State to make arrangements was consolidated due to the conduction of private investments.

Brazil faced re-specialization and re-commodification in the 1990s, and it deepened the country's historical statistic and absolute competitive advantages in standardized sectors and the continuous processing of mineral, forest, energetic, agricultural and agronomic resources, such as iron ore, steel and aluminum (basically, semi-finished metal goods), oil and petrochemical, cellulose and paper, food (grains, orange juice, meat, etc.), as well as in standardized textile production.

Briefly, the commercial opening and financial processes, the disruption of the State's ability to signalize and coordinate the privatization of production systems and infrastructure, the internationalization of the leading chains composing the national production poles, among other factors observed in the 1990s, caused important changes in relations set among Brazilian regions. It happened due to the spatial re-concentration of richness and income from 1985 to 2002 and to the worsening of inter- and intra-regional inequalities.

CHANGES IN BRAZILIAN TERRITORIAL REALITIES IN THE LAST FIFTEEN YEARS (2003-2018)

The significant growth achieved by the Brazilian economy, mainly during Lula's administration, from 2003 to 2010, led to critical territorial effects. The Northern, Northeastern and Midwestern regions recorded higher GDP growth rates than the other ones (Southern and Southeastern). This outcome contributed to the reinforcement of divergences and the improvement of the living conditions of the population.

It is necessary taking into account a set of determining factors in order to learn interrelated changes and to reason about their possible spatial cumulative effects. Thus, the present article aims to link the main determinants observed in a great variety of interrelated changes in response to the primary changes (MYRDAL, 1960), to cumulative effects and to some effects that somehow neutralized regressive effects on regions and urban-regional markets in less developed spaces.

The productive and economic dimensions from 2003 to 2018 demand analyzing the private investment trends and the micro-dynamic logics of the business world based on each clinical conjuncture, because "business decisions about purchase, sales, active development and competitive strategies have played, all together, different roles in a geographic scenario" (...) "Why is it important studying the behavior of

companies in regional economies? Business decisions face either the inter-regional distribution of the economic activity or the quality and nature of labor within regions” (MARKUSEN, 2005, p. 64-65). Assessing the industrialization process and its sectorial profile, the nature of investments made in each region, questioning whether the induction of productive abilities has generated and boosted productive local diversification or excessive specialization; analyzing the type, amount and quality of the created job positions, assessing the sectors and regional effects of the macroeconomic environment of cannibal valorization and of high interest rates, became the core elements to question whether the regional growth trajectories were virtuous, or not.

The quantitative and qualitative changes in the productive regional structure are determining to the herein addressed context. Undoubtedly, the industrialisation process contributed to the development of material, modern and advanced production forces capable of promoting profound changes in social productivity. This process was the very core of the historical and social development of a sovereign Brazilian nation; it also broadened and deepened the technical and social division of labor in a society undergoing complex evolution. This complex society set new connections, and their interdependence lied on the techno-economic chains of society’s productive apparatus and its essential decision-making agents. The changing chained-actions of society randomly build their own paths, trajectories and development styles in each country.

To assess the evolution of productive structures at a regional and national scale it is necessary analyzing moves observed in the key-variable of the productive-force development known as investment. It is required having in mind the complexity of capital inversion and investment determinants; moreover, it is essential checking whether there was a mere occupation of existing production capacity in the assessed space or the implementation of new industrial facilities and non-existing sectors by deepening the inter-sectors and inter-regional and inter-urban features.

From 2003 on, the increase in rural and urban incomes reinforced the urban-regional networks in mid-sized cities, improved sophistication and broadened consumption differences. The group of non-durable consumer good producers grew when they were able to compete with the arrival of imported products. Therefore, new location fronts were opened due to the creation of new wage goods facilities. It happened because of the implementation of poorly technologically sophisticated industrial poles of light and low linkage generation. These productive sectors were decentralized; they were featured by the weak demand for more complex environments in terms of externalities. Thus, they could be attracted by significant peripheral poles, mainly in metropolitan areas or in mid-sized cities substantiated by regional capital. This process was often triggered by fiscal wars given the ample supply of subsidies and other favors, by lower costs with wages, by higher labor and environmental flexibility and, in some cases, by easy access to abundant and cheap sources of natural resources. This traditional industrial sector was essential to industrial decentralization and to decrease regional inequalities, because “it forms a productive fabric more permeable to the action of mid- and small-sized companies, hires intermediate level workers or workers with lower qualification and; therefore, it better fits the resources available in these new industrial regions” (KUPFER, 2012, p.8).

The Brazilian economic geography went through substantial changes, mainly between 2004 and 2014, even when it was not guided by clear industrial strategy,

because the private and public decisions were little, or not, guided by Plano Brasil Maior (Bigger Brazil Plan). Massive investments of private capital supported by the State, mainly by BNDES, were made in the agro-business, in the mining sector, in the automotive industry and infrastructure. Massive investments were in course in automotive, steel, oil, naval, refinery and mineral extraction facilities, etc.

Investments were made in automotive facilities, some are already operational, and some others remain in construction phase: Chery (Jacareí/SP); Nissan (Resende/RJ); Jeep (Goiana/PE); BMW (Araquari/SC); Jaguar Land Rover (Itatiaia/RJ); Honda (Itirapina/SP) Hyundai-Caoa (Anápolis/GO); Audi-VW (São José dos Pinhais/PR); JAC (Camaçari/BA); Hyundai (Piracicaba/SP), Toyota (Sorocaba/SP and Porto Feliz/SP) and Mitsubishi (Catalão/GO). Many investments were made in steel companies until 2011. Nowadays, the Brazilian steelwork park, with its 29 plants, belongs to 11 business groups (Aperam, ArcelorMittal Brasil, CSN, Gerdau, SINOBRAS, ThyssenKrupp CSA, Usiminas, VSB Tubos, Vallourec, Villares Metals and Votorantim); however, these companies have been facing a severe crisis. Many projects were expected to play a central role in regional development, such as Companhia Siderúrgica do Pecém, in São Gonçalo do Amarante, which has been waiting for further investments.

Before its deep crisis, Petrobras' investments to explore the pre-salt layer and to make its supply chain feasible was planned based on strong national content. It involved 30 production platforms, 28 drilling rigs, 88 oil tankers to modernize Transpetro's fleet and 146 support boats. The estimated amount invested in purchase orders to the Brazilian naval industrial reached US\$100 billion. Due to the crisis, projects of new refineries were either resized or delayed, such as Abreu Lima Refinery (PE), or postponed, such as Comperj (RJ), or yet abandoned, such as Premium I (MA) and II (CE) refineries. Nevertheless, the impacts from the announcement and construction of these mega-enterprises were huge, they represented strong real estate speculation, higher cost of living and the attraction of migrants, etc., to the locations and surroundings of these ventures.

Investments in mining, except for oil and gas, reached US\$50 billion every five years from 2003 to 2015, with emphasis on investments made in Minas Gerais and Pará states. These states were granted with the highest investments: 41.8% and 21.93% of the total invested, respectively. The other Brazilian states that have received investments in mining were MS, BA, CE, PI, AM and MA.

The Brazilian marine industry was relaunched, given the broadening of offshore oil activities, which demanded the ordering of new ships. The installed capability was quickly amplified to its peak, and shipyards were distributed as follows: 11 (RJ), 3 (SC), 2 (RS), 1 (CE), 1 (SP), the biggest of all was the Atlântico Sul, in Ipojuca County (PE).

In order to see the big picture of investments made, and in course, in Brazil, it is important assessing the meaning of macro-projects launched by the Brazilian government between 2007 and 2015. PAC (Growth Acceleration Program) (<http://www.brasil.gov.br/pac>) aimed at mobilizing a simultaneous powerful block to invest in infrastructure.

Law 10.847/2004, implemented at the beginning of Lula's administration, allowed the creation of EPE (Empresa de Pesquisa Energética – Energy Research Company) and Law 10.848/2004 changed the way electric power was traded in Brazil;

it opened room for a boom in investments in this sector. There are 30 operational UHE, they were auctioned after 2000, with emphasis on the biggest ones: Jirau (RO); Santo Antonio (RO); Teles Pires (MT and PA); Estreito (MA and TO); Foz do Chapecó (SC and RS). The 2030 National Energy Plan still predicts the increase by 88 thousand MW; 11 thousand MWs will come from Belo Monte, in Vitória do Xingu(PA). Other 10 UHEs are still at construction phase, among them: Ponte de Pedra (MT), Salto Curucaca (PR), Colíder (MT), Baixo Iguaçu (PR), São Roque (SC), Cachoeira Caldeirão (AP), Salto Apiacás (MT), Sinop (MT) and São Manoel (PA). Besides investments in power plants, there is the perspective of implementing wind power complexes, due to investments estimated in R\$ 35 billion, whereas solar energy would receive R\$ 6.6 billion. These two fronts mean great expectations for regional development, mainly in the Northeastern states.

PAC II was responsible for more than 538 thousand electric power connections to 2 million people living in the countryside, in agrarian reform settlements, in indigenous reservations, and quilombola and riverside communities. Therefore, it represented great improvements in the living conditions of people living in the countryside. In total, 28 enterprises focused on oil exploration and production were concluded; moreover, 448 oil exploration wells started to be drilled: 174 offshore and 198 onshore of them were completed.

Since the creation of Secretaria de Portos da Presidência da República (SEP/PR) – Secretary of Harbors of the Presidency – in 2007, and the formulation of PNL (Plano Nacional de Logística Portuária) – National Plan of Harbor Logistics – in 2010, and mostly because of Law 12.015/2013, the harbor sector saw the opportunity to have new investments in new terminals and to modernize the existing equipment. Thirty (30) enterprises were concluded or were supposed to be implemented until 2015. From 2016 on, an important part of these terminals was bought by the Chinese capital.

According to Agência Nacional de Transportes Aquaviários (Antaq) - National Water Transportation Agency – investments made in Suape Harbor, in the Industrial Complex in Ipojuca County (PE); in Pecém, in Fortaleza (CE); and in Itaqui Harbor, in São Luiz (MA), besides the modernization in Santos, Vitória and Paranaguá harbors allowed the internal production to flow faster due to more efficient operations and to the Brazilian logistics efforts to achieve significant changes. Investments made in Private Use Terminals (TUPs), firstly in Açú Harbor, have reached almost 50 terminals in Brazil, nowadays.

Investments expected to be made in airports reached R\$260 billion. Six (6) auctions were conducted in order to provide concessions to the following airports: São Gonçalo do Amarante/RN, Brasília/DF, Guarulhos/SP, Campinas/SP, Confins/MG and Galeão (Tom Jobim)/RJ. The capacity of Brazilian airports was expanded to more than 70 million passengers a year due to the conclusion of 37 enterprises, as well as to the recovery of runways and parking lots in the following airports: Foz do Iguaçu (PR) and Campo Grande (MS) and to the construction of Terminal 4 in Guarulhos (SP). In total, 15 construction projects were concluded in regional airports in 11 cities.

There are 19 waterway enterprises in course, with emphasis on the Amazon and in the Midwest. Cabotage navigation has also been reactivated.

Throughout the last four years, 1,088 Km of railroads were concluded, with emphasis on improvements in the flow of commodities such as minerals and food.

It is also worth analyzing the social protection policies that represented an essential input for the reduction of regional and income inequalities in Brazil between 2003 and 2015. A comprehensive set of social policies came along with the real increase in the minimum wage, in rural social security and payroll loans, among others. All these factors had substantial impact on the very basis of the Brazilian social pyramid.

Another vital policy that may further bring huge technological and productive impact to the country was the expanded access to higher education; college enrollments doubled between 2003 and 2014. In 2003, 747 counties had undergraduate students registered in the Higher Education Census. This number reached 1,568 counties in 2014. Fourteen (14) new federal universities and 126 new college campi were launched; therefore, the total number of college students raised from 5.9 million to 13.5 million. The Federal Network of Professional, Scientific and Technological Education reached 644 units in 2016.

Throughout a certain period-of-time, mainly between 2004 and 2014, the country somehow accomplished economic growth and social inclusion. Such process joined the social policies, the expansion of the domestic mass consumer market and the formation of new labor relations.

TYPES OF INVESTMENTS IN DIFFERENT BRAZILIAN TERRITORIES

Next, an analytical construct is introduced by using a heuristic resource to create a taxonomy of public and private investments. It is important highlighting that such a construct was only an interpretation scheme aimed at boosting the debate about changes in the Brazilian territory. In other words, the goal is to propose an instrument of general analysis to perform successive approximations through a kind of ideal-type species focused on the mere comparative effects of different phenomena, or stylized facts. It was done to develop a classification process elaborated to assess the impacts of recent investments on different Brazilian territories.

First of all, it is worth highlighting the guiding hypotheses about the recent socioeconomic changes Brazil went through. These changes had significant territorial impact and the specialized analysis applied to them yet is not enough to fully capture their dynamics and, most of all, the direction taken by them. Accordingly, there was the argument about whether some of the public policies under discussion or implementation would be based on concepts presenting poor adhesion to the current mutating territorial reality.

Therefore, it is crucial discussing an updated agenda focused on fully absorbing the most significant territorial changes in order to elaborate public policies aligned with the present time. The idea was to develop an analysis scheme and some stylized facts capable of broadly absorbing and systematizing the recent, and most general, territorial changes through public and private expending in different territories.

Assumingly, such typology could open analytical spaces to organize structuring questions such as: What are the accumulation fronts opened, made available and feasible, given the nature of the public and private investments made? What is the state action character demanded by each one of this investments? What are structured and required public policies? How is the state involved in this policies? Based on a

multiscale and multi-level analysis, what are the interests resulting in regional, national and international scale, in each territory? What associations do they have with the input (scale, dimension, complexity) of cities, the complexity of the urbanization process and the relations with their respective rural areas? What are their connections with environmental issues? What is their relationship with Science, Technology and Innovation, as well as with the power alliances and the inter-federative relations?

It is evident that the aim of the present study did not lie on triggering, or answering, all these questions at all territorial levels; however, such complex and crucial questions must come along with the analysis.

TYPE I TERRITORIES – TERRITORIES PREDOMINANTLY UNDER IMPACT AND REDEFINED BY THE INERTIAL FORCE OF AGGLOMERATION AND URBANIZATION FACTORS (COAST, MRS AND STATE CAPITALS), AND OF LOCAL PRODUCTION ADVANTAGES IN THE SOUTH-SOUTHEAST URBAN NETWORK.

Historically, cumulative inertial and centripetal forces had polarized impact on the Brazilian coast. Such impact meant real urban-industrial platforms that corresponded to greater development levels of productive and innovative forces found in typical conglomeration, socioeconomic density, productive diversification and social differences factors. The investments realized tended to be concentrated in these regions, where one can see the typical effects of neighborhood and transshipment effects, a dense and modern consumption market, a differentiated labor market, more sophisticated services, etc.

Inter-regional economic conjunctions have operated in Brazil for one century, and it reinforced the socio-spatial concentration and polarization capacity of this area. The national economic system designed in the XX century reached a high degree of commercial and productive integration. Such design encompassed a matrix network of Fordist intra- and inter-economic relations (incomplete and dependent copy in the periphery of capitalism in the first and second industrial revolutions) that were structured and consolidated in the Southeastern region of the country. The same matrix expanded to the Southern region and the Eastern coast.

The areas mentioned above concentrated an industrial-merchant real-estate financial complex ruled by a spatial division of labor based on central-peripheral relations aligned with the expansion projects and with coalitions focused on long-term development conventions (1933/1982). Historically, the Southeastern region, mainly the State of São Paulo, became the very core of capital accumulation in the country. This region concentrated the industrial production and the most sophisticated services, the most complex urbanization process and became the national economic decision-making center.

However, countervailing factors resulting from the concentration in the Southeastern region, from negative externalities, from congestion effects and other diseconomies caused by agglomerations, as well as the implementation of state public policies, were put in practice between 1975 and 1985. Nevertheless, some of these factors remained as practice after this period, and this process led to regional decentralization of economic activities from the Southeastern region to the others. The direction taken by this trajectory first headed South, and it made the inter-

regional division of labor in Brazil in the late XX century and early XXI century more complex, fact that demands further, and in-depth, research.

New ventures were implemented in this region, with emphasis on great industrial and logistic condominiums, shopping-malls, technological poles, on new public research centers, etc., which may play the critical role of providing new inter-sector externalities and complementarity in the future.

The vast South-Southeast-Coast area is subjected to great anthropogenic pressure, environmental degradation, water crises, climate changes and external events that can be featured as anthropocentric. It is so because this area is the territorial fraction where the material human action changing the demographic density was more remarkable, mainly in the Atlantic Forest biome. This “Atlantic territory” houses the most organized Brazilian urban network; 70 million people live in this area; all these people composed the main regional and urban subnetworks.

This region also houses the main circuits of urban-regional systems and sub-systems, its main metropolitan spaces and state capitals; besides, it is the leading chain connecting the Southern Cone. It is the core of the South-American integration because it is the most developed area in the continent. Emerging spaces rose in this regions in recent times, and they are marked by deindustrialization, loss of productive diversification, regressive specialization and by the beginning of many production chains, the expansion of the tertiary sector (traditional and contemporary), of summer and business touristic activities and financial services, etc.

The spatial effects of investments guided by the inertial forces of agglomeration, urbanization and pre-existing location advantage factors demand future research focused on discussing the effects proposed by Gunnar Myrdal (1960). It must be done by questioning whether the spread effects would have prevailed in these Type I Territories, as well as have favored changes in circular causes that could have been prolonged, or not, due to growth. Moreover, these changes could be stopped and cause back-wash effects on farther regions. According to Albert Hirschman (1977), it would be reasonable discussing the flowing effects, or tricking-down effects, in opposition to polarization effects by questioning the balance of forces between them. It is clear that effects have interacted in this inertial territories in “Atlantic Brazil”, but they ended up boosting liquid results that have impaired growth in other regions, with emphasis on the transmission and diffusion of stimuli in its closest territorial fractions.

TYPE II TERRITORIES – TERRITORIES PREDOMINANTLY IMPACTED AND REDEFINED BY THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PUNCTUAL INVESTMENTS THAT TENDED TO BECOME ISOLATED POLES, OR ENCLAVES WITH LOW INDUCTION IN THE SURROUNDING AREAS AND HINTERLANDS.

Mega-projects for investments in great construction sites and the extraction of natural resources, and in basic inputs to process enclaves are the intermediate assets spread in the territory by huge plants that present intensity of remarkable scale.

These sectors have a hard time connecting back- and forward inter-sector relations. According to MARKUSEN (1995), these enterprises could be featured as stick places (satellite manufacturing platforms), as attraction areas and as investment retention. They often have low threads, mainly forward threads, which are ruled by

exogenous commands based on extra-regional decisions. These processes configure isolated poles or limited, isolated or inter-sectorial and inter-regional induction.

The idea of typifying these investments shined light on the specificity and possible territorial impacts from the implementation of mining and basic input units, as well as of some isolated macro-enterprises that may have intense macro-regional impacts, such as the Pre-salt layer, the Transnordestina road, Sao Francisco River transposition, the intense use of great mining sites, the exploration of extensive touristic poles and the implementation of great harbors for oil refining.

It is important having the morphology of these oligopolistic-market structures in mind to analyze the territorial impacts of these investments, which record high production technique scales that represent differentiated cost advantages guided by mass production methods. These scales are inserted in mature segments and have low value-aggregation capacity, content and technological sophistication.

Investments have allowed the process to decentralize production. However, regional development results ended up in production islands given the nature of sectors that have moved to the national periphery. In other words, the quality of the decentralization process in less developed regions did not reach the expectations in comparison to some international experiences that have allowed expanded economic activity and further regional mooring in peripheral areas.

These investments are mostly induced by the State and by raw material sources about to be explored. Overall, they do not present any potential inter-sector, inter-regional and inter-urban relations.

They are highly great platforms in the territory and in the built environment. These platforms elaborate semi-manufactured products from the agribusiness, mining and steel industry that provide primary inputs such as steel, cellulose, non-metallic minerals, etc., as well as energetic inputs such as oil and gas prospection, extraction and refining, and hydroelectric, wind and solar power. Briefly, they are decisive to the Brazilian industrial matrix and represent most of our export commercial and production expertise and reveal the country's comparative competitive advantages.

This sector went through a significant business adjustment due to mergers and acquisitions that have broadened its productive and managerial efficiency. It also has many on-going projects, given its long-term investments. This scenario becomes a barrier to the entrance of, and dissuasive factor for, new competitors in the market. The dynamics of the sector is linked to orders coming from the public sector, to the configuration of state-policy coalitions and to relationships set with the State, since its activities are often polluting. This sector demands an abundant supply of cheap energy and flexible environmental licensing processes. Its great projects are commonly defined or supported by "external" funds and investments; moreover, it is explicitly and exogenously determined by macro-politics. These extra-regional decisions represent factors reinforcing the tendency of the project to develop under little, or none, interaction with hinterlands in the region, and under little, or none, virtuous induction in its surroundings. Projects in this sector are consolidated throughout their maturation time given the precarious complementary relations and articulations with the regional economic fabric.

Overall, these punctual investments are located in places lacking centrality, mainly structured urban networks. Thus, they are localized exports bases, regionally disintegrated and partially integrated into the national and international market.

The spatial effects of these punctual, limited, isolated or enclaved investments have low capacity to induce platform surroundings, hinterlands and farther locations. Therefore, it is easy boosting discussions based on the reflections about poles by François Perroux (1964). Unfortunately, there is no room here for deepening these discussions; however, further empirical research could try to assess to which extent such localized growth-points could exert, or not, positive action in several impulse intensities and the capacity to outspread different channels. Further research could also assess whether these discussions could, or not, exert a decisive action and become cores, knots or triggering points, or even dominating growth units, capable of spreading stimulus from agglomerating poles, at different gradients: from closer areas to the farthest ones. At first, most of the herein assessed investments do not present great ability to add value, and to outspread and transmit intra- and inter-regional growth. Moreover, the political-institutional instability in Brazil determines how often these investments are subjected to continuous solutions given the beginning of new economic cycles that follow other political coalitions; past potential expected for these poles are not concluded by current administrations.

TYPE III TERRITORIES – TERRITORIES PREDOMINANTLY IMPACTED AND REDEFINED BY THE WORLD DEMAND FOR COMMODITIES.

A vast Brazilian territory is specialized in agricultural, mineral, steel and energetic commodities. Recently, these spaces suffered a substantial impact from the increased demand and prices in international markets.

Investments in commodities have remarkable territorial, environmental and economic impact, as well as many deficiencies in their inter-sector, inter-regional and inter-urban relations. There are vulnerabilities in the economic growth of highly specialized regions because the dependence on agricultural, livestock and mineral commodities is open to strong and repeated price and demand fluctuations that are primarily defined at the global scale.

Besides the significant agricultural production, mainly of cotton, rice, coffee, sugarcane, beans, sorghum and maize; the extraction and processing of minerals, mostly of phosphorus, limestone, iron, manganese, granite, marble, copper, zinc, gold, nickel, niobium, quartzite and ceramics is essential.

The concentration of investments in the central portion of the national territory is widely recognized in the XX century Brazilian history. The “Great-West” occupation and integration features are known in the inter-regional division, it started in the “March to the West” (in the 1940s) and in the construction of Brasília (in the 1960s), and expanded to the agricultural, livestock and mineral frontiers. Public policies substantiated Cerrado incorporation to contemporary agricultural production. These policies articulated and glued this macro-region to the dynamics of the other three Brazilian “regional worlds”. The tertiary sector in this region is based on the supply of agricultural assets, such as companies that trade fertilizers, seeds and farming implements, mainly companies concentrated in the central intermediate urban poles in the Mid-West and Mid-North.

A quite peculiar economy and society were formed in this area in the last decades, it is modern and sophisticated, and lives with serious land ownership conflicts. The

region has a quite specific rural feature and problematic urbanization, which is diffuse and metropolis-based, mainly in the Goiânia-Anápolis-Brasília axis.

However, its high specialization in the extraction and production of commodities set structural limits to the endogenous dynamics of its economy. These differences are imposed by the intrinsic nature of its mineral, agricultural and livestock assets, which are based on static and absolute competitive advantages. These advantages present poor differentiation ability because they are standardized and depend on continuous processing; moreover, they are mostly subjected to the definition of international prices and demands.

Regional gains reinforce – with enormous economic, rural, urban and productive dynamism - its role of the transition point between the Southeastern and Southern regions, on the one hand, and between the Northern and Northeastern regions, on the other.

The great transformation boosted by the agribusiness in this vast territorial portion resulted in biodiversity losses and in soil and water degradation due to deforestation and burns in two quite fragile and sensitive ecosystems: Cerrado and Pantanal, both found in these regions.

Sérgio Castro (2014) well synthesized the challenges faced by the region when he stated that the great agricultural and industrial complexes, and mineral extraction and processing plants installed in these regions require consistent strategies either upstream or downstream of their respective productive chains. At upstream, they encourage the development of the local machine, equipment and input production; besides, they boost specialized technical services. In the downstream, they differentiate products presenting higher added value.

Nowadays, in Brazil, there are politically well-organized sectors influencing the parliaments and class organizations; moreover, they control the communication means.

Basically, the State demands logistic infrastructure to dispatch the production, it subsidizes and forgives loans, and intermediates debt renegotiations.

The impact of these investments have on the territory are defined by the world demand for commodities. Douglass North (1977) discussed the regional development that was enabled by the Export Base Theory. This theory explains the growth in a specific place, which is determined by foreign markets. The unifying and bonding cohesion of activities practiced in a region focused on the production of goods to be sold in overboard regions could encompass, or not, the ability to create complementary subsidized, local, non-basic activities in the analyzed region. The initial point of the analysis applied to the hypotheses emerging from this theory seems to indicate that commodities, given their very nature, have created few, or restricted, possibilities to launch for new local non-basic activities in the concrete Brazilian contemporary situations.

TYPE IV TERRITORIES – TERRITORIES PREDOMINANTLY IMPACTED AND REDEFINED BY INVESTMENTS MADE, OR GUIDED, BY THE STATE IN TRANSPORTATION AND POWER GENERATION INFRASTRUCTURE.

The infrastructural support is sometimes followed, and boosted, by investments in productive activities, including systemic competition factors, since it results from, and creates, externalities and generates synergy with high use generalization degree.

Some territories are more directly impacted by these investments, and they crystallize growth, expansion and integration axes of great spatial inertia and rigidity. The massive amount of investments and immobilization of fix capital, the “irreversibility” / “individuality” of investments, the matter involving great scales, the high positive externalities, among other factors, leave remarkable marks in the territory.

The “Exports Ails” project was launched in 1972, it would be included in PND I and cross the Axes and PAC, but the government have blocked the demands and kept these investments permanently in the Brazilian territorial history. It is evident that investments in infrastructure are essential to any Brazilian region; however, they are essential for the Amazonian Biome. This biome is the largest frontier of resources on the globe, and its vast area has crucial geopolitical dimensions, its penetration and integration axes, and the great projects of economic exploration developed for the region, along with the availability of transportation and power generation infrastructures end up fulfilling and articulating the Amazonian economy to the rest of the Brazilian and international economy. This Biome is a massive forest, mineral, hydric and biodiversity spring that also presents great amounts and diversity of socio-political actors and economic interests. It is the stage for the combination of many different development levels of productive forces, as well as for the coexistence of legal and illegal exploration activities (mineral, timber, biopiracy, etc.)

This macro-region was strongly impacted in recent times by the implementation of power plants, mainly after Laws 10.847 and 10.848 from 2004 were implemented. These laws changed the way power is traded in Brazil; they opened routes for a boom in investments made in the sector. From this year on, 30 UHE were auctioned, with emphasis on the biggest ones: Belo Monte (PA), Jirau (RO), Santo Antonio (RO), Teles Pires (MT and PA), Estreito (MA and TO). Other 10 UHE have been constructed, among them, one finds Ponte de Pedra (MT), Colíder (MT), Baixo Iguaçu (PR), São Roque (SC), Cachoeira Caldeirão (AP), Salto Apiacás (MT), Sinop (MT) and São Manoel (PA).

Investments in Private Use Terminals (TUPs) under implementation and in North-South Railway, which has more than 1,500 Km of operational rails, configure a true march to the Brazilian Mid-West. Thus, it is certain that the economic dynamics in the Amazon is linked to the availability of infrastructure; however, this availability is not necessarily restricted to the road-hydroelectricity binomial. The biodiversity and richness of supplied eco-systemic services, specific local knowledge, cultural diversity and accumulated traditional ways of life should allow that construction of other patterns of development in this vast Brazilian “regional world”.

The spatial effects of investments guided by expenses with transportation and power generation infrastructure, similarly to that of Type I Territories, demand further and detailed empirical investigations to test hypotheses based on the methodological references already referred by Myrdal (1960). He tried to measure to which extent these changes would have, or not, imposed spread effects, i.e., outspread, centrifuged, inter-sector diffusion and inter-regional transmission in opposition, or in confrontation, to blocked effects of adverse and negative changes and repercussions. In other words, they would be back-wash effects on other regions that are mainly not benefited by investments in infrastructure networks. Accordingly, based on the conceptual apparatus by Hirschman (1977), it is possible assessing the effects influencing, or the trickling-down effects associated with polarization effects.

In the case of territories where the growth axes are notorious and follow the more consolidated expansion and spatial integration trajectories, investments are featured by irreversibility and certain indivisibility. There is an overall trend of reinforcing polarization and of more adverse repercussions to prevail in more isolated regions, or in regions farther from these axes.

TYPE V TERRITORIES – TERRITORIES PREDOMINANTLY IMPACTED AND REDEFINED BY SOCIAL POLICIES, BY IMPROVEMENTS IN LIFE CONDITIONS AND SOCIAL EQUIPMENT, AND BY THE EXPANSION OF THE DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION MARKET.

Inequality, in its multiple dimensions, is the most indelible mark spread and well-distributed in Brazil, it is “homogeneous” throughout the national territory and observed both in more and less developed regions. Between 2003 and 2014, there was a significant improvement in assets of social policies focused on protecting the most vulnerable layers of society and on the expansion of the internal market. These actions were possible given the advancements in income transfer policies, the increase in the number of formal job positions, the valuing of the minimum wage, and the credit expansion. These changes mostly happened due to the extension of credit available in the market, to better income distribution and the quality of the labor market, etc.

An essential support to citizenship was somehow built during the period as mentioned above, it was a kind of ground for social safety and the access to individual rights. It was the guarantee of more dignifying life conditions since it aimed at meeting essential needs and the possibility of having part of mobs historically apart from progress in Brazil to enter and integrate the contemporary society.

Significant changes also took place in the relative process of the Brazilian economy, and they favored the consumption of assets-wage. These changes were determined by the “China effect”, by the exchange rate and the policy of relief developed by the federal government.

The sub-sectors of this assets-wage production department are responsible for the features of non-durable consumer goods such as the traditional ones: leather shoes, clothing, non-standardized textiles, simple furniture, low elaboration agribusiness food and beverage, which recorded great expansion and some displacement trajectory heading towards peripheral regions, mainly in the coastal portion and in mid- and large urban centers. A remarkable increase in electronic and communication, automotive, household appliances, pharmaceutical products, furniture, cosmetics, white appliances (washing machines, ovens and refrigerators), motorcycles, computers, TVs and mobile phones production and access have boosted the expectations of generating future structural changes. The most inclusive growth observed in this region had a straight impact on all these sectors, which were made viable by the elasticity of the demand and availability of credit for consumers. It happened because these factors were susceptible to fluctuations and depended on quantitative and qualitative changes in urban labor and consumption markets and the expansion of income patterns in the rural and urban centers.

However, the herein highlighted growth did not lead to structural changes, but it led to income leaks and to the loss of opportunities to use the multiplying and accelerating effects of increasing consumption in regional domestic markets. This

process ended up encouraging the expanded participation of imported goods or goods produced by Brazilian extra-regional companies.

These Type V Territories are the ones supposed to be more affected by the political changes in course since 2016. The implemented constitutional amendment has created the expenditure cap and froze governmental primary expenses for two decades. These territories must feel the impacts of these changes in a more direct way.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The period between 2003 and 2018 clearly shows the massive differences in great income-concentration patterns and of low access to richness and property, mainly to rural and urban land. These two factors strongly limit regional consumption and production markets, as well as creates enormous barriers to improvements in the production and business fabric that are more endogenous in less developed regions. The herein addressed period allowed these markets to expand a little more and could create potential future accumulation fronts and more regionalized markets if, or when, the country overcomes the economic crisis or when political changes take place. However, it is clear that other resources and infrastructure supports need to be improved and to be kept in place to forge a more autonomous economic basis.

Despite the input and complexity of the most significant regional peripheral poles, the narrowness of more interiorized markets still precedes the energizing boosts reinforced by the fiscal activism of the State.

An important point linked to the current diagnostic, which was designed for the new regional dynamics, lies on looking forward to better understand the multiple dimensions of economic, social and environmental impacts from a whole set of construction sites in the national territory. These sites were stopped, launched “before the projects were over”, not concluded, or even abandoned. Most regional development expectations were disrupted; besides, it is possible observing the negative impacts this process has left, mainly on areas housing great projects that were stopped.

There is an agenda of investments to be made in infrastructure that has lasted for many administrations of different ideological spheres, some of them are regional claims from the 1990s that were found in the “exports aisle” (1972), in ENIDs and, afterwards, in PAC. The country did not reason about whether some of these construction sites are no longer part of a strategy developed to the insertion of these regions in the techno-economic paradigms of the XXI century.

It is worth setting a more full democratic debate about the strategic choices that would encompass successful projects or projects presenting future potential, projects that would gather and spread resources from several sources, promote technical and managerial qualification and that would lead to new financial engineering based on a wider time range. It would be done by selecting resources from investment projects capable of indeed triggering and supporting the domestic/local markets of each region, as well as a most sovereign and dynamic insertion in the international market.

All these factors must be revealed in order to keep the permanent struggle against harmful and multi-dimension inequalities, mainly the social and regional ones, in the core of the governmental agenda. This action would assure the search, rise and valuing of the national heterogeneity and diversity. Simultaneously, it would activate

and mobilize the diversity features, since the process is sensitive to differences, but also reveals and explores the potential of assets and qualifies the idle and sleepy ones.

Such strategies must be built in a democratic way, it must be able to prospect and apprehend sub-regional specificities, but it cannot be localized. Therefore, this process demands consequent state actions that must be participative and rescue planning by taking into account the complexity of the federation.

Interpersonal inequalities observed during the herein analyzed period got a little better, but the Brazilian inter-regional disparities remained and embodied another nature. On the other hand, the regional issue, which is a problem in the center of the State, was not yet adequately set or politically legitimized given the hardness and complexity of solving the Brazilian regional issues.

There is no doubt that the great challenge faced by the country to launch territorial planning remains. This planning should develop strategic vectors capable of boosting dynamic impulses to generate more extensive income convergence, opportunities and a cohesion process (economic, social and political) among the heterogeneous regions of the country, although respecting and valuing its diversity.

While central countries develop and implement technological, productive and bold strategies to the so-called industry 4.0, which is based in a new wave of digitalization and connectivity of things, peripheral countries, such as Brazil, walk backwards.

If, in the past, only extreme crisis situations were capable of legitimizing more coherent and democratic interventions through regional and urban public policies, what can one expect from the current scenario?

Carlos Antônio Brandão holds a Doctorate in Economic Development at Unicamp. He is Professor in the Institute of Urban and Regional Planning and Research at Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (IPPUR / UFRJ). Scholarship holder CNPq.
E-mail: brandaoufrj@gmail.com
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9014-6681>

Article received on 14th April 2018 and approved for publication on 13th February 2019.

Licensed under a Creative Commons License (CC-BY).

REFERÊNCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

- BACELAR DE ARAÚJO, T. Herança de diferenciação e futuro de fragmentação *Estudos Avançados* 11 (29), p.7-36. jan./abr., 1997.
- BARAT, J. Corredores de transportes e desenvolvimento regional. *Política e Planejamento Econômico*, 2(2), p. 301-338, dez., 1972.
- BRANDÃO, C. A. Espaços da destituição e as políticas urbanas e regionais no Brasil. *Nova Economia*, 26, n. Especial, p. 1097-1132, 2016. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0103-6351/3961>.
- BRANDÃO, C. A. (org.). *Teorias e políticas do desenvolvimento latino-americano*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto/Centro Celso Furtado, 2018a.
- BRANDÃO, C. A. The multi-scalar articulation of economic development In: FERNANDÉZ, V. R.; RONDINO, G. *Development in Latin America: critical discussions from the periphery*. New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2018b.
- BRANDÃO, C. A.; FERNANDÉZ, V. R.; RIBEIRO, L. C. Q. (Orgs.). *Escalas espaciais, reescalamentos e estatalidades: lições e desafios para América Latina*. Rio de Janeiro: LetraCapital, 2018.
- BRENNER, N. et al.. Após a neoliberalização?. *Cadernos Metrópole*, 14 (27), p.15-39, 2012.
- CANO, W. *Desequilíbrios regionais e concentração industrial no Brasil – 1930-1995*. São Paulo: Global, 1985.
- CANO, W. Novas determinações sobre as questões regional e urbana após 1980. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais*, v. 13, n. 2, p. 49-59, nov. 2011.
- CARDOZO, S. A. Comércio internacional, estrutura produtiva industrial, emprego e renda

- nas macrorregiões brasileiras (2004-2014). *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais*, v. 20, n.2, p.401-420, mai./ago., 2018.
- CASTRO, S. D. Política regional e desenvolvimento: caminhos para o Brasil e para o Nordeste. In: BNDES. *Um olhar territorial para o desenvolvimento - Nordeste*. Rio de Janeiro: BNDES, p.502-539, 2014.
- DINIZ, C. C. Desenvolvimento poligonal no Brasil: nem desconcentração nem contínua polarização. *Nova Economia*, 3(1), p. 35-64, Belo Horizonte, 1993.
- GUIMARÃES NETO, L. Desigualdades regionais e federalismo. In: AFFONSO, R.B. & SILVA, P.L.B. (org). *Desigualdades regionais e desenvolvimento*. São Paulo: Fundap/Unesp, p. 13-59, 1995.
- HIRSCHMAN, A. O. Transmissão inter-regional e internacional do crescimento econômico. In: SCHWARTZMAN, J. (org.). *Economia regional: textos escolhidos*. Belo Horizonte: Cedeplar, 1977.
- HIRSCHMAN, A. O. Desenvolvimento por efeitos em cadeia uma abordagem generalizada. In: CARDOSO, Fernando H., FONT, Maurício e SORJ, Bernardo (orgs.). *Economia e movimentos sociais na América Latina*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1985.
- HIRSCHMAN, A. O. *Estratégia do desenvolvimento econômico*. Rio de Janeiro: Fundo de Cultura, 1961.
- KUPFER, D. O setor e o território. *Jornal Valor Econômico*, 14 de março de 2012.
- MARKUSEN, A. Mudança econômica regional segundo o enfoque centrado no ator. In: DINIZ, Clélio Campolina; LEMOS, Mauro Borges (orgs.). *Economia e território*. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2005.
- MARKUSEN, A. Áreas de atração de investimentos em um espaço econômico cambiante: uma tipologia de distritos industriais. *Nova Economia*, Belo Horizonte, UFMG, (5)2, p. 9-44, 1995.
- MONTEIRO NETO, A. *Desenvolvimento Regional em Crise: Políticas econômicas liberais e restrições à intervenção estatal no Brasil dos anos 1990*. Tese de Doutorado. Campinas: Instituto de Economia da Universidade Estadual de Campinas, dezembro de 2005.
- MONTEIRO NETO, A. Políticas de desenvolvimento, território e pacto federativo: avanços e limitações no quadro atual (2000/2012). *Revista Política e Planejamento Regional*, v. 2, n. 1, p. 19-38, 2015.
- MORAES, S. R. *Desconcentração Produtiva no Brasil: olhares sobre o período 2000-2015*. Dissertação de Mestrado. Brasília: PPGDSCI/CEAM, 2017.
- MYRDAL, G. *Teoria econômica e regiões subdesenvolvidas*. Rio de Janeiro: ISEB, 1960.
- PACHECO, C. A. *Fragmentação da nação*. Campinas: IE/Unicamp, 1998.
- PECK, J. *Constructions of neoliberal reason*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- PERROUX, F. *A economia do século XX*. Lisboa: Herder, 1966.
- PERROUX, F. O conceito de polo de crescimento. In: SCHWARTZMAN, Jacques (org.). *Economia regional: textos escolhidos*. Belo Horizonte: Cedeplar/UFMG, 1977.
- PINTO, A. Heterogeneidade estrutural e modelo de desenvolvimento recente. In: SERRA, José (coord.). *América Latina: ensaios de interpretação econômica*. Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra, 1976a.
- PINTO, A. Distribuição de renda na América Latina e desenvolvimento. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1976b.
- PIQUET, R. P. S.; RIBEIRO, A. C. T. Tempos, ideias e lugares: o ensino do Planejamento Urbano e Regional no Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais*, v. 10, n. 1, p. 49-59, mai. 2008.
- SAMPAIO, D. P. *Desindustrialização e estruturas regionais no Brasil*. Tese de Doutorado. Campinas: Instituto de Economia/Unicamp, 2015.
- SANTOS, M. e SILVEIRA, M. L. *O Brasil: território e sociedade no limiar do século XXI*. São Paulo/Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2001.

- SIQUEIRA, H. Novo-desenvolvimentismo e dinâmica regional recente no Brasil (2004/2013). Santiago do Chile, *EURE*, 41 (122), p. 261-277, enero, 2015.
- SUNKEL, O. e PAZ, O. *O subdesenvolvimento latino-americano e a teoria do desenvolvimento: os conceitos de desenvolvimento e subdesenvolvimento*. São Paulo: DIFEL, 1971.
- TAVARES, M. C. Distribuição de renda, acumulação e padrões de industrialização: um ensaio preliminar. In: TOLIPAN, R.; TINELLI, A. C. *A controvérsia sobre distribuição de renda e desenvolvimento*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores, 1975.