



SÉRIE TEXTOS DE DISCUSSÃO CEAG/UnB

001/16

0018

Redes e Governança das Políticas Públicas

Wellington Almeida

**Centro de Estudos Avançados de Governo e de
Administração Pública - CEAG**

Brasília

2016

Universidade de Brasília

Reitor Ivan Marques de Toledo Camargo



Centro de Estudos Avançados de Governo e Administração Pública

Coordenador Wellington Almeida

Laboratório de Análise de Políticas Públicas do CEAG (LAPP/CEAG)

O Laboratório de Análise de Políticas Públicas do CEAG (LAPP/CEAG) é formado por professores e alunos da Faculdade de Economia, Administração e Contabilidade (FACE/UnB), Instituto de Ciência Política (IPOL/UnB) e Universidade de Brasília Campus Planaltina (FUP/UnB). Seu objetivo é desenvolver atividades de pesquisa sobre temas relacionados à avaliação e análise de políticas econômicas e sociais. Com esse intuito o grupo apoia o desenvolvimento de pesquisas fundamentadas em diferentes abordagens metodológicas, estimula a elaboração de artigos, dissertações e teses, promove encontros acadêmicos e incentiva a participação de seus pesquisadores em eventos científicos no Brasil e no exterior.

Textos para Discussão (TD)

Editor: Luiz Guilherme de Oliveira

Publicação cujo objetivo é divulgar resultados de estudos desenvolvidos por pesquisadores do CEAG da Universidade de Brasília (UnB).

As opiniões emitidas nesta publicação são de exclusiva e de inteira responsabilidade dos autores, não exprimindo, necessariamente, o ponto de vista do CEAG/UnB.

É permitida a reprodução deste texto e dos dados nele contidos, desde que citada a fonte. Reproduções para fins comerciais são proibidas.

<http://www.ceag.unb.br/ceag/public/biblioteca/index/tema/padrao/tipo/TD>

DRAFT

Democracy and (in) equality in Brazil today¹.

Wellington Almeida²

This article has as a goal to debate, initially in the format of an essay, several political hypothesis' related to the weight and the role of the conflicts surrounding the inequality/equality agenda, and how they affect Brazilian democracy today. We begin with the premise that the tense societal relations, that are expressed more and more through conflicts of opinion which come across as radical and excluding- in social networks and on the streets- are more serious than they appear. And they may also worsen if the democratic windows are not kept open by civil and political society. Furthermore, we argue that the evidence and perceptions about the huge inequality which is present in our society is at the root of this conflict, and that forces us to review some ideas about our social conciliatory formation and the acceptance of inequality as a value.

This article will revisit the transition literature to discuss the process and reconstruction of Brazilian democracy in the last three decades. During this period (1964-2015) the country has gone through many challenges in its process of democratization: the end of the authoritarian regime (1964-1985) brought about a constitutional process, in which the choices related to the design of the political institutions were made, which led to the development of many of the economic stability plans, and improved civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, along with creating new public policies in several areas to overcome the extreme levels of poverty.

However, this process has always been tense and difficult, having as its greatest challenge, historical inequality. Due to this, the tensions returned with greater intensity during July 2013, when diffuse political movements took to the streets to protest against the living conditions, especially the living conditions in major urban areas. Since 2013, Brazil has been involved in a polarized political struggle, through different extracts of social classes, which has had strong reflections on democratic institutions. The central hypothesis of this article is that the current political tension in the country is a result of the rupture of social acceptance of inequality. Although there is a long discussion on Brazilian social inequality, there are insufficient studies about the emergence of radical political conflicts as a result of this framework. The main argument is that such studies are necessary for the continuity of the democratic process as a response for this challenge.

Brazilian inequality is nothing new and has been greatly debated under various different angles in the last three decades, especially when the concepts that measure it become more well-known to a broader public audience, especially when the analysis of the concentration of income supplied by the Gine Coefficient and reflexes that are amplified in the inequality in the access to public goods that are measured by the Human

¹ A preliminary text open to critique and suggestions for changes, available at www.ceag.unb.br, in the section Texts for debates-TD. The final version will be debated on at the panel "Consolidation of Democracy in a World on Inequality" at the Congress of the International Association of Political Science- IPSA, in Istanbul, in the month of July of 2016.

² Political Scientist, researcher of CEAG and professor in the Post-Graduation Program of Human Rights and Citizenship at the University of Brasília- UnB.

Development Index- HDI of the United Nations. In relation to this, there is a methodological debate about the evolution and/or regression of inequality in the various political contexts of the country throughout the past century and in the first 15 years of this century that have been receiving significant attention from the academy, bringing out new and important revelations³. But in this analysis, the present proposal has another goal, which concentrates especially on the political challenges.

It is true that Brazilian inequality has historical and social specificities that deserve attention and investigation for a better design of policies that are favorable to its transitions for standards that are acceptable and aligned to the democratic process. However, here we argue that many of the symptoms of the current political tension are the fruit of the tension provoked by inequality, and this has much in common with the global political symptoms that pressure the process of globalization in a world that is marked by the questioning of the advent of inequality. In this sense, the analysis of the Brazilian case demands some contextualization.

The Discontents of Globalization

The long and historical process of globalization has accelerated in a radical way in the last decades, which had some impulse from the political and technological changes from the 80's and from the beginning of the 90's of the last century. Among the structural changes and the emerging new global order that we can highlight, according to the sequence of events presented by Viola (1992) there are some central aspects: the dwindling down of east-west conflict, with the reform of the Ex-Soviet Union and the posterior dismantling of socialism in Eastern Europe; the new technological paradigm, that began in the 70's of the last century; the advance of liberalism to the detriment of stronger state policies and the consolidation of the role of the market as a dynamic mechanism in the allocation of goods and services; the expansion of NGO's as a new political and social pole alongside the market and the State; the acceleration of the economic component in the process of globalization through transnational companies and global financial markets; the exponential growth of air transportation and the emergence of information systems with planetary dimensions; the emergence of global problems, with emphasis on the environmental issues and human rights. In this process, the hegemony of the economic component has intensified, along with the liberation of the global markets to the detriment of the regulatory capacity under the scope of the Nation States. In relation the global structure of governance, it also developed through an asymmetrical process, because an institution that is capable to moderate this movement that provoked radical changes from the previously established order was not created.

Therefore, the contemporary political analysis still seeks answers for a group of phenomenon that is provoked by this process, made manifest in the agenda of the redistributive conflict and in the demand for the recognition of rights. This has a direct impact on the political processes in the area of values and institutional frameworks both on the local and transnational levels. The dynamic of global markets that emerge in the process of globalization shed light on the difficulties that exist when dealing with the inequalities in the scope of national policies. In some countries that are characterized as

³ An inevitable highlight for the new approaches are the studies that are led by Marcelo Medeiros at the University of Brasília and in the Institution of Research and Applied Statistics- IPEA, Medeiros is innovative as he readily studies that country's risks. In an approach similar to Piketty's, he has been carrying out new research based on a source that has not yet been fully explored (data from the Federal Revenue of Brazil). Check out his new work along with Souza H.G.F, Pedro (2015) *Top Income Shares and Inequality in Brazil, 1928-2012*.

western democracies there is an intense debate about the decline of governmental redistribution programs, which are considered to be insufficient to compensate for the inequalities generated by the market. The case of Greece and the dismantling of the bipartite system in the recent Spanish elections reflect this debate. In Europe, there is also the growing debate about the decline of public support to redistribution policies and the advance of political lines that are opposed to ethnic and racial diversity in the labor force, revealing at the most part, intolerance and the violation of human rights. This framework is another permanent source of tension in relation to the global migratory process and to the refugee crisis' that the poorer regions of the planet are currently facing.

A theoretical attempt to map out the changes in contemporary social and political life, which was initially labeled as pessimistic, can be found in the work of Bauman (1999, 2000, 2001), for example. Some general issues that emerge in the theoretical effort of Bauman brings to the fore several challenges to the political rightist and leftist trends that fully accept the democratic game and elect as a priority the defense and the development of democracy as the only possible space for the debate of ideas and mediation of human conflicts that are inherent to the more free egalitarian organization of human communities. For Bauman, we would need to start with the premise that globalization is not a choice. We are all submitted to this process and this basically means the same thing for all of us. We are living through a process of globalization that divides us as well as unites us. In this global movement that we are all involved in, be it *"against our will, through designation or default"*, a globalized minority that freely circulates around the word excels. But the broader idea of freedom of movement is a mirage, a scarce product, distributed in an unequal way, revealing the elements of stratification in late modernity. We can see in this movement a progressive special segregation, separation and exclusion. Understanding these general characteristics is the basic condition necessary to deal with other challenges that are made manifest in the receptive point in the process of globalization where neo-tribal and fundamentalist⁴ trends emerge. Bauman's analysis proves itself to be in this sense, connected to an extensive and plural critical literature on the globalization process, which would be named as the reflexes of the crisis of contemporary democracy in the context of the undeniable conservative hegemony in the market societies. The challenge for the trends that bet their cards on a more inclusive democracy and that are opposed to the logic of progressive expansion of inequality are those that map out the process of the disaggregation and representation of social players that seek to discuss the possible signs of re-aggregation of a social and political field that would be able to support the agenda of human rights in the 21st century.

The academic and mediated impact of the important works of Piketty (2014) can be explained in part by these signs of global discontentment along with the evidences and perceptions that are provoked by the growing inequality in the world. This process is diffused, incipient, and contradictory; but also, it reflects signs of organization and the articulation of demands for rights that are beyond the frameworks of traditional institutional policy, according to the description by Castells (2007; 2011), Piketty's work returns to another level, in the context of the questioning of inequality, which are the academic debates on equality and justice. He duly advocates the idea that the issue of inequality and of redistribution is at the crux of the current political conflicts. He discusses the choices related to the dimension of public actions of redistribution, bearing in mind that there is an ample debate that organizes these options, placing on one end,

⁴ Any kind of fundamentalism. Not necessarily only religious or only from certain religions.

the theoretical defense of moderate action, limiting the instruments of action of the State, and on the other hand, the defense of a more incisive public action, with strong State action that goes beyond only tax collection. These strong divergences on the dimension of political action reflect options related to economic and social mechanisms that act in the production or reduction of inequality. Such differences, however, do not pose any impediment to a reasonable theoretical consensus on basic principles of justice. In this consensus, the idea that inequalities that originate from the family or simply luck are highlighted, and therefore individuals cannot be held responsible, and they demand the action of the State to improve the conditions of that person or social group. (PIKETTY, 2014 a). On this point, Piketty takes on a clear position in favor of more incisive political action, supported by the principles of justice formulated initially by Rawls (1971). This action is guided by the principle according to which each society must maximize the opportunities and minimum conditions supplied by their social system.

The data related to the evolution of inequality in this phase of ample hegemony from the financial and economic component in the process of globalization are clear, even for the wealthier and developed nations. The more recent data on the evolution in the last 25 years of the countries that are members of the Organization for Cooperation and Development- OECD- show that there has been an increase of seven times per nine times and a half, in the difference among the wealthiest 10% and the poorest 10% (Keeley, 2015). Since there is no regulatory force in the instruments of political mediation in the global, regional and local scope to deal adequately with this trend, it is possible to observe clear signs of questioning on the persistent growth of inequality in all of the regions under new forms of political action. This issue questions contemporary politics in the more developed and underdeveloped nations, in more deficient and consolidated democracies, besides being a source of concern in relation to the political leadership of closed regimes, as revealed in the excellent works of Zhang (2013) on the reflection and intervention of the decision makers in China in the articulation of the transformations of the governmental functions during the Era of economic reforms, which were articulated with the strategic concern on the risks of the growing rates of inequality.

Movements that are impulsed by regional, religious and cultural identities are at the core of the political movements for recognition and inclusion. Old and new social movements raise the issue of inequality as a point of articulation for the political agenda. That is what happened, for example, in the Occupy movement first in the United States and later in other countries such as Spain, besides the huge mobilization of the “Arab Spring” that shook and took down governments in the Middle East. It was no different in Brazil with the mobilizations of July of 2013, that still remain to be better understood as a phenomenon of questioning the contradictory changes in course, that challenge our capacity to find new democratic paths to overcome our difficult social, political and cultural reality.

The Brazilian Case

The Brazilian challenges in respect to the tension between democracy and inequality present both the elements of this global trend as well as endogenous dimensions. Adopting the hypothesis that the survival of Brazilian democracy depends on the establishment of a minimum reasonable solution in order to overcome the current standard of inequality, is the reason for which here, we seek to map out what would be the main obstacles and possible paths to overcome them. An important starting point for

this assessment is the positive trajectory of the last experience of the reconstruction of democracy in the country in the last three decades, after 20 years of the military regime. It is considered positive, since it was the longest period of continuous democratic alteration in the country. In this experience of 30 years, all of the most representative political forces had the opportunity to compete in free elections, to win and put into practice their political proposals; in other words, from the point of view of the rules of the game and the inexistence of any constraints or restrictions to the dispute for democracy, in the polyarchic model that Dahl (1971) developed, we complete the transition process of democracy.

After 2003 we went through the greatest test of this democracy with the arrival of the government of the party that was the leader throughout the process of democratic reconstruction, to the opposition of the leftist party. We certainly cannot state that the socialist leftist, reformist or social democratic party represented by the Workers Party (Partido dos Trabalhadores-PT) came into power in Brazil to implement their project as happened in other experiences throughout the 20th century. Beyond the different historical context that limits the greater process of change, we must take into account the Brazilian political system- characterized by 'coalition presidential system'- that is structured by a fragmented party framework where the winning party of the presidential elections rarely reaches 20% of the parliament. In order to govern, it is mandatory to set up a frequently contradictory coalition in ideological terms. Despite this, the party that leads the coalition still has power and in a general sense, is capable of guiding the public policies and strategic choices.

This coalition that is/ was led by PT governed Brazil for 3 mandates between 2003 and 2014, and conquered another mandate for 2015-2018. The coalition is in crisis and the Workers Party is in an even greater crisis due to involvement in corruption and the loss of credibility of their political discourse and economic proposals. The mandate of the president of the Republic, Dilma Rousseff, is up for questioning and may be interrupted through a constitutional process of impeachment. Independent of the way that this more immediate conjuncture plays out (which is not the object of this analysis), we watch the end of a political cycle. This cycle is closed not only due to the impasses that were created by the current coalition under the PT's leadership. The political and economic analysis that dominate the debate in the media (including the more specialized publications), and also in the academic field have a strong concentration in the aspects of the errors of the economic choices taken and in the visions related to the insertion of the country in globalization. With no disregard to this debate, which is certainly important, it is necessary to go beyond it, and investigate the structural aspects that are relocated in another level of the current conjuncture, starting with the demands that come into play related to rights and equality. In this sense, the closing of this cycle indicates with more emphasis that the inexistence of a political agenda that is able to respond to these demands, and still, inevitably, indicates the necessity of a formation of a new coalition that is able to propose a new agenda for the country.

We expect that the democratic learning process of the last three decades and the economic potential of the country along with the reasonable institutional framework of the State will supply an agenda solution and the emergence of a new coalition that is able to provide the necessary leadership for it. This does not mean, however, a democratic agenda with progressive inclusion and the reduction of the inequalities that are at the core of our political tensions. It is always possible to mobilize institutional and symbolic instruments of power to maintain the essential *status quo*, according to the Brazilian

historical tradition of highly concentrated economic wealth, political capital, as well as human and cultural capital that is generated by the whole of society. The price of this option is the fellowship of a violent society, profoundly unequal and perplex when facing the societal changes in course. This is a price that need not be paid and would not even be the case if there was the preponderance of a minimum strategic consensus as a result of a more mature political debate. Reaching this level is not an absurd utopian option. Other countries offered better solutions for their social and political organizations within their own symbolic and material limits.

This would be a task for politics and institutional construction.

In this sense, a constructive and plural vision on our democratic experience of these last three decades may reveal progress, backtracks and crystallized resistances, that mask the demands for a more democratic, inclusive and tolerant society. It is not in any way an easy task, because there are many uncontrollable variables that are mainly exogenous. It is a huge challenge to negotiate internal pacts in a world in which national mediation resources are more and more fragile. The existence of a greater crisis that covers all societies is not an impediment to the redesign of democratic policies and pacts that are inclusive for certain national communities.

As a preliminary balance of the 30 years of democracy in the country some of the central aspects that deserve more attention as far as the research agenda that is concerned with new paths for the renovation of the democratic agenda. We can point out five preliminary aspects: 1) Valuing and the deepening of the institutional process; 2) Universal and reparatory public policies; 3) the articulation between civil and political rights and an agenda of reduction of inequalities; 4) rethinking of the productive base and the country's international insertion; 5) modernize the political system and amplify the mechanisms of debate and the circulation of ideas.

The current Brazilian political situation is tense. The country is politically divided, lacking a clear agenda, besides not having a political coalition that is capable of leading a path to overcome the democratic deadlock. The political system, according to the opinion of a good amount of political analysts, is in a state of collapse. The current government has lost the necessary conditions to lead initiatives and operates with low governability and undergoes the risk of being interrupted. The opposition also does not have sufficient power to turn the game around within the democratic rules that are in force. A reflection of this tension is the emergence of aggressive conflicts on social networks or those that are for now, isolated in public locations. In this scenario it is important to look toward the positive aspect of the development of institutions and society itself, in regards to the questioning of the historical conflict between the private and public spheres, that challenges all of the democratic societies, as Bobbio (2000) argues . It is important to register, for example, that many of the cases of corruption that became public in the last few years is due to the process of modernization of the institutions of the State in its various levels (Judiciary, the Public Prosecutor's Office, the system of fiscal control, among others) that provided grater control and inspection of the relations between the State (through which the greater amount of the economy of the country passes) and the private world and the political world. These institutions are working despite their failures and limitations. However, it is fundamental to value this process of institutional construction in a country that is marked by ruptures in its democratic order. To recognize that this process is effective in some dimension and that possible solutions may arise from it is the first step.

The conquest in the articulation and development of a network of public policies in that last 30 years is another aspect that deserves a pondered analysis, to identify the progress, the setbacks, the tensions and the blockages. In the second half of the 80's of the last century the country experienced a deep economic crisis with the exhaustion of the economic and political options of the military regime. The crisis of this period overflowed into a social crisis with the occurrence of many acts of civil disobedience and vindications such as supermarket robberies, and thefts in the transport of cargo, along with occupations in rural and urban areas, among others. All of this discontentment was channeled into the process of the formulation of the new constitution of 1987-1988. The new Constitution that entered into force on the 5th of October of 1988, elaborated before the dismantling of real socialism in Eastern Europe, rejected significant proposals of the redistribution of assets (land reform, for example), but pointed to a generous pact of the construction of new economic, social and cultural rights, besides formally reestablishing civil and political rights.

A hopeful agenda with a lot of expectation emerges as the result of this new constitutional process and inaugurates a new attempt for democratic construction in the country. And despite the persistence of the economic crisis – which will progressively demand the search for new paths due to the exhaustion of the national developmental model which became unfeasible in the globalization process- the democratic experience is effective in many areas. A significant contingency of the population begins to revel in the rights through the social security systems (especially in the rural areas) and of social assistance. The universal health and education policies, although they are low in quality, they do not eliminate the efforts of a greater coverage and the beginning of a process of continuous evaluation in the educational system and the inclusive and innovative conception of the Unified Health System- (SUS- Sistema Unico de Saúde). With the economic stability that was reached in the middle of the decade of the 90's in the last century, the country began the structuring of a network of social protection, by articulating focal reparatory policies along with the universal policies. They are the conquests of democracy that do not rupture the standard of inequality in a consistent way, but that still need to be valued and improved. There was an expectation that with the rise to power of the leftist party in the government for the first time in the country⁵, that an agenda would be set up that could tackle and face in a deeper way the inequalities that generate so much tension in Brazilian democracy. The Lula and Dilma governments did approach some points of tension, but they did not outline structural postures, such as for example, the redistribution of assets for a more equal society as did the reformist left during the 20th century. Some sectorial policies were amplified, as well as the implementation of others that were important for the Brazilian societies. Among these are the quotas for public universities, the increase of support to family farming, social programs, and the valuing of the minimum salary. They were important gains, such as the stabilizing of the Brazilian currency, provided by the real plan, in the beginning of the 90's. They are gains for society and democracy, fruit of a clear singling out of rights, given through the constitution of 1988.

Alongside these positive points that we can emphasize, drawbacks and inertia in other areas of rights and public policies may be pointed out, such as in public security, environment, land reform, and indigenous lands. But considering that the gains and progress in social indicators were big, and, yet, in the period strong economic expansion

⁵ This statement is not without its contestants, because in terms of an Agenda it is possible to state that the government of Joao Goulart (1961-1964) was more leftist that the experience under PT's leadership, ever since 2003.

due to the commodities cycle- a good amount of that happened during the Lula government and in the first two years of Dilma's mandate- the income of the poorer segments of the population⁶ increased considerably, how can we explain the political radicalness that began to take over the country, after the protests of July 2013? Part of this explanation may come from the electoral dispute itself, which was strongly impacted by the evidence of a systemic network of corruption that brought so much discredit to the political system, beyond what was historically well known.

But the hypothesis that we intend to explore here- although it does not despise that explanation- goes along the lines of trying to understand the changes in society that are related to the conflicts that emerge between connected and disconnected factors, starting with the issues such as new channels of information, consumerist values, greater comprehension of the relations of inequality, exhaustion of public policies of self-reproduction of privileges, political crisis, the crisis of institutions, among others. What seems to have happened were silent movements within society, which indicated new demands for political renovation and the expansion of rights. In this sense, many of the rhetoric disputes and symbolic disputes that happened during this period seem to be disconnected from the deeper issues that challenge us. They do not dialogue with the root of the tectonic movements of a complex society, that as it gathers more information, demands new rights and services, but does not find decent paths for deeper reforms in the direction of a civil level of equality and citizenship. Here therefore, we reject a catastrophic forecast and instead bet on the construction of political alternatives, and attempt to map out what could be the main outlines of a new agenda that is able to articulate civil and political rights and the strong reduction of inequalities in the current Brazilian reality.

A crucial issue in order to face this challenge is linked to the need to rethink the productive base and the international insertion of Brazil. The excessive prejudice and ideology of the debate about alternatives for the country in the context of globalization has provoked huge damage to society. Extreme positions that go from the complete denial of the possibility of the State developing a strategic role in the articulation of development, to the idea that the State can perform all the coordination of the agenda, as what occurred during the national developmental period, contaminate the alternatives. Instead of this polarity what we need is the construction of a strategic consensus that can comprehend the limits and possibilities of all the players.

It is necessary to articulate long term projects and not to create illusions based on favorable economic circumstances, which are not sustainable as what happened in recent years during the cycle of high demand for commodities in the more intense period of 'Chinese globalization'. Of course, that is not wrong and any government should take advantage of those opportunities. To the contrary, they should be used to support initiatives that can bring the country to break away from the predominance of the export of primary goods. In this period the government forwarded some megalomaniac-like proposals that are typical of the military regime, with a focus on large projects, with very little concern for the protection of the environment and the rights of indigenous and traditional peoples. The opportunity to invest in public policies of innovation was lost, as

⁶ In the hopes of conciliation under the 'win-win' rationale, without dealing with the central issue of redistribution of assets, there was a clear increase in the income of the decile of the poorest 10%, between 2004-2014. In this segment had an income increase of 129%, meanwhile among the richest 10% the increase was that of 32%. Data from the newspaper Folha de Sao Paulo (15.12.2015), based on the analysis of the Getulio Vargas Foundation of IBGE data.

well as policies of transition to a low carbon economy, the structuring of inclusive entrepreneurship, support to the creation of medium sized ventures with the capacity for insertion in global value chains, institutional modernization of the public universities, among other measures. All of this could have been done, if dogmas were left behind, without denying completely the possibility of state activism in the search for national alternatives that are agreed upon with society. To construct a minimum consensus and to prepare the country to act strategically within the real limits that are imposed by globalization is a necessary and serious task for society, and for the State.

At last, we have the challenge to modernize the political system, to open the mechanisms of debate and the circulation of ideas. The defense of the democratic legacy of these three decades- the longest period of democratic regulation in the history of the country- does not mean being blind to the limits of the current political model and its legitimacy crisis. There is a generalized discredit with politics in Brazil, but this is not exclusively an internal problem and it can be observed in other democracies. This is why it is crucial to avoid magical illusions. The first magical solution that should be avoided is in relation to the necessary modification of the electoral and representative system. In the center of the representation crisis, which is an empirical phenomenon of most democracies, what always comes up in the Brazilian debate is the “political reform”. If there are any points of the minimum agenda that seem to be fundamental in order to breakdown the workings of or the life of politics, the rest are escapism. The only substantial change that would simplify the solution to the crisis and highlight in a proper manner the available agenda for the country, it would be a parliamentary system. But at this moment, it would be another great casuistic approach due to the credibility of the Congress and due to the democratic decision that was obtained through a referendum, guided by the terms of the 1988 Constitution.

However, our problems are very far from suggesting that the political system is the only one responsible for this crisis. The system allowed the alteration of the government through all of the relevant political lines that were organized in the process of re-democratization. It certainly is now in collapse and needs to be reviewed, but the greater dilemma goes way beyond that alone: we do not have a minimum consensus on a project for the nation that can prepare us for the gigantic task of producing wealth, maintaining and increasing rights in a globalized world, in which decisive variables such as education and innovation, for example, have a lot of weight. Our performance in these areas is pitiful and we need new institutional mechanisms for debate in order to revert the deficit of strategic formulation. The capacity of formulation of strategic consensus also depends on the increase of the number of institutions that have the profile of ‘Think Tanks’. It is necessary to end the rigid debate of traditional players, by valuing the role of organizations from civil society, among others, that are interested in promoting this kind of debate.

The problems and challenges are gigantic. But the only path out is renovation of politics and hope. The only thing worse than the exit of the current political system would be its criminalization as the discourse of some minor sectors suggest that despise democratic rules, that at this moment, for obvious reasons, finds echoes in common sense and due to the distaste and rejection of corruption. It is time to look again at the idea that our society, in its majority, supports inequality and corruption. We need to politicize the fight against corruption and praise the work of the bodies responsible for the processes of investigation and punishment as an institutional advance and not the persecution of a certain political party/current.

This process of questioning the political structures that merely reproduce and that are addicted to power is a worldwide phenomenon. It is the natural result of the emergence of a society in network that demands the updating and the capacity of dialogue of the institutions that are responsible for taking care of social demands. This process displays attempts of social re-aggregation in order to maintain the perspective of sociability. Different than what conservatism defends, it does not exclude the reflection of agendas of democratization that were not yet performed. To the contrary, it offers the reconstruction of meaning and replaces all of the vindications that are linked to the values of freedom and equality, independent of the hegemonic rational of production.

It is with this spirit and agreement that we can carry on in the debate, making the political dispute legitimate and democratic, in any theme that challenges society, through formulating policies of greater equality as a strategic consensus to pacify society. Nothing should be forbidden. to the contrary, we should follow on in the search for an active civil society that questions human misery, that fights against violence and sexism, that is opposed to environmental tragedy, that defends the autonomy of social organizations and that seeks land reforms that are ecological and sustainable, that defends wide freedom of opinion, without any previous control of any kind, but that does not refuse the debate of economic regulation of any sector, including the media. Through these and other issues should our agenda be renovating, dealing with our own reality, but at the same time exercising our freedom to critique and freedom of thought.

References

- BAUMAN, Zygmunt. Globalização - as consequências humanas. Rio de Janeiro, Zahar, 1999.
- BAUMAN, Zygmunt. Em busca da política. Rio de Janeiro, Zahar, 2000.
- BAUMAN, Zygmunt. Rio de Janeiro, Zahar, 2001.
- BOBBIO, Norberto. Teoria geral da política : a filosofia política e as lições dos clássicos. Rio de Janeiro, Campus, 2000.
- DAHL, Robert A. Polyarchy: participation and opposition. New Haven: Yale University, 1971.
- KEELEY, Brian. Income Inequality – The Gap between Rich and Poor, OCDE, December 2015. Disponível em www.ocde.org
- PIKETTY, Thomas. Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2014.
- PIKETTY, T. L'Economie des Inégalités. Paris, Éditions La Découverte, 2014a.
- RAWLS, John. A Theory of Justice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- SOUZA, Pedro H. G. F.; MEDEIROS, Marcelo. Top Income Shares and Inequality in Brazil, 1928-2012. Journal of the Brazilian Sociological Society, v. 1, n.1, p, 119-132, 2015. Disponível em <http://diagramaeditorial.com.br/sid/index.php/sid/article/view/2/23>
- VIOLA, Eduardo. A expansão do ambientalismo multissetorial e a globalização da ordem mundial 1985-1992. Caxambu, Anpocs, 1992. www.anpocs.org.br
- ZHANG, Wenjie. From Growth-base to Service-Oriented – How have the Chinese Policymakers transformed government functions to combat wage inequality during the reform era. Grenoble, 1• International Conference on Public Policy, 2013. Disponível em <http://www.icpublicpolicy.org>