Artigos

Self-Management as a Tool to Organize Counter-Hegemony

Joysi Moraes*

Abstract

The basic premise in this article is that human beings cannot exist outside the "community", that is, outside organization, and that organization molds human life in its material form and it is shaped by it (DUSSEL, 2002). Therefore, the question is the following: if we are somehow organized why not organize counter-hegemony from the bottom and start inside the dominant regime itself? The purpose of this essay is to discuss a certain way of organizing that may contribute to the construction or organization of a counter-hegemony against the current regime. The Gramscian argument is here used, that is, the construction of a (counter) hegemony occurs through the organization of consent without resorting to violence or coercion yet through ideological construction with the understanding that it is in the ideology and through ideology that a class may exert its hegemony over the others, that is, it may assure adhesion and consent (GRAMSCI, 1978). The paper attempts to show that organizations with self-managing proposals essentially carry the germ cell of counter-hegemony because they are based on horizontal practices and democratic organizations that have broken the strong hierarchical, asymmetric and clientelistic relationships which prevailed for centuries.

Keywords: Counter-hegemony. Self-management. Organization.

Autogestão como Instrumento para a Organização da Contra-Hegemonia

Resumo

A premissa básica deste artigo é que o ser humano não existe fora da "comunidade", ou seja, não existe fora da organização, e que a organização molda a vida humana na sua forma material e é moldada por esta (DUSSEL, 2002). A questão, portanto, é a seguinte: se somos ou estamos todos organizados de alguma maneira, porque não organizar a contra-hegemonia desde baixo e a partir de dentro do próprio sistema dominante? Discuto, portanto, neste ensaio, sobre a possibilidade de que o modo de organizar, ou de uma determinada forma organizativa, pode contribuir para a construção ou organização da contra-hegemonia ao sistema dominante. O argumento utilizado é gramsciano, ou seja, a construção da (contra)hegemonia se dá a partir da organização do consentimento, sem qualquer recurso à violência ou à coerção, isto é, pela construção ideológica, entendendo-se que é na ideologia e por meio da ideologia que uma classe pode exercer sua hegemonia sobre outras, ou seja, pode assegurar a adesão e o consentimento (GRAMSCI, 1978). O objetivo é mostrar que organizações com propostas autogestionárias já trazem o gérmen da contra-hegemonia, pois são pautadas por relações horizontais e democráticas que têm rompido com as relações hierárquicas, assimétricas e clientelistas que se mantiveram durante séculos.

Palavras-chave: Contra-hegemonia. Autogestão. Organização.

*Doutora em Administração pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul – UFRGS. Professora do Departamento de Administração da Universidade Federal Fluminense. Endereço: R. Saddock de Sá, 290/101. Rio de Janeiro/RJ. CEP: 22.411-040. E-mail: joysimoraes@yahoo.com.br

Introduction

Las teorías que realmente importan son las que surgen
de la necesidad y las que se llevan a la práctica.

Emilio, Tierra del Sur *in* Sitrin, 2005

F irst of all, I would like to start from the basic premise that the human being cannot exist outside of the "community", that is, outside of the organization, and that the organization molds human life in its material form and it is shaped by it (DUSSEL, 2002).

Communities are understood as a whole in themselves, and they constitute parts of another totality (like an area, region, etc.), which by its turn, constitute part of a greater totality (a country, as part of a continental totality) (FREIRE, 2005). *Community* herein shall not be understood as a synonym for people living in permanent harmony, sharing values, common interests and needs – a simplified view that refers to something static and homogeneous (MILANI, 2006). On the contrary, the community herein is composed of people with interests that may be contradictory and marked by power relations. It is not a paradisal view of a type of community where there are no differences and where consensus reaching or decision making will not show either the differences between the subjects or the existence of different degrees of power distributed among people (GUIJT; SHAH, 1998; MILANI, 2006).

The community organization is one whose starting point is the questioning by the subject about his own position in the process of organizing, i.e., the individuals are the subject of the act of organizing (FREIRE, 2005). *Organizing* here means the act of socially producing unstable modes of cooperation which are always in motion. Such *organization* is carried out through different processes and practices guided by strategic critical reason; as an activity in which each participant learns to accomplish different responsibilities, always within the unity of consensus collectively produced (MISOCZKY; MORAES; FLORES, 2009, p. 468). Therefore, it does not mean exclusively the *organization* that is synonymous with *company*.

Therefore, the purpose of this essay is to discuss a certain way of organizing that may   contribute to the construction or organization of a counter-hegemony against the current regime, composed mainly of vertical organizations. The Gramscian argument is here used, that is, the construction of a (counter) hegemony occurs through the organization of consent without resorting to violence or coercion yet through ideological construction with the understanding that it is in the ideology and through ideology that a class may exert its hegemony over the others, that is, it may assure adhesion and consent (GRAMSCI, 1978). The Gramscian way of organizing may be represented by the voice of Flores (2006): "Cuando con otros somos nosotros". In short, along the essay I will try to show that organizations with self-managing (horizontal) proposals essentially carry the germ cell of counter-hegemony, against the dominant regime, once they are based on emancipating practices. Emancipation, in this text, has production, maintenance and reproduction of life within the community as a reference, according to Dussel's formulations (2002). It is the assertion of relationships that are radically different from those established under conditions of oppression and domination, of a negatively experienced situation, in which the forces and identities capable of aspiring a different life are forged (MISOCZKY; AMANTINO-DE-ANDRADE, 2005). I do not use *emancipation* in the sense of disenchantment with the world, or emancipation of the reason of myths and imagination.

Hegemony is here understood as

> not only a unison of economic and political aims, but also intellectual and moral unity, posing all the questions around which the struggle rages not on a corporate but a universal plane, and thus creating the hegemony of a fundamental social group over a series of subordinate groups (…) the development expansion of a

particular group are conceived of, and presented, as being the motor force of a universal expansion (..). In other words, the dominant group is coordinated concretely with general interests of subordinates groups, and the life of the State is conceived of as a continuous process of formation and superseding of unstable equilibria between the interests of the fundamental group and those of the subordinate groups – equilibria in which the interests of the dominant group prevail, but up to a certain point (GRAMSCI, 2005, p. 181-182).

By the same token, counter-hegemony, according to Kebede (2005, p. 82), "even in its limited form is also multidimensional just as hegemony is. It is either directly or indirectly intended to challenge the cultural, political, intellectual, and economic leadership exercised by in establishment groups partially or in its entirety". That is, the construction of counter-hegemony also occurs through the organization of consent without resorting to violence or coercion yet through ideological construction.

Gramsci did not pose abstract problems apart from human lives and therefore has built up his work around the central idea of building the hegemony of a class. As a strategy such hegemony while strategy would have the task to organize and unify this class so as to acquire, through its own experience a conscience held responsible for the duties of classes ascending the power of the State, once it was thought that the "subordinate" definitely could neither become subject nor unitary before conquering the power of the State.

A class, a structural concept or something reduced to relations of productions because people in a class are not all directly joined by the production process itself neither by the appropriation process, i.e., the bonds linking the members of a class are not defined by the mere statement that the class is structurally determined by the relations of production. "The class concept is seen as a relation and process to be observed over time as a standard in relationships, institutions and social values. A visible phenomenon, only within the process" (WOOD, 2003, p. 77). A class in the process of becoming or creating a political force by itself.

Therefore, the construction of a counter-hegemony would start from a project carried out by this class in the heart of an organization whose organizational practices would involve group work under the coordination of the group itself, taking into a count everyone's expertise at the same time.

In the hospital organization, for instance, the expertise of the physician must be respected. People who do not hold specific medical knowledge must not inter-fere with the physician's work. However, planning and activities related to the hospital organization as a whole would be carried out collectively. An example of that can be found in Gramsci (1989, p. 7), when he highlights that "all men are intellectual, but not all men play the role of intellectuals in society". In order to make it clearer, he explains further: "the same way, the fact that at some point someone can fry two eggs or sew a hole in a jacket does not mean that everyone is a cook or a tailor".

It is obviously a step by step, a slow but continuous building process. A project with national roots and international articulations, a political force in which politics is the *praxis* of subjects educated to socialize and rule the world.

Therefore, the question is the following: if we are somehow organized why not organize counter-hegemony from the bottom and start inside the dominant regime itself? Organizing for sure, but starting from a logical basis not from the one based on hierarchical relations. The new organizations should be based on solidarities, joint responsibilities, freedom and autonomy, in short, on all presuppositions of emancipation because we already know the consequences of the hegemonic way of organizing.

Thus, to start constructing from the bottom means to build power and not to take it over, which clearly indicates a construction process, moving from the smallest to the biggest, from the simplest to the most complex, going upward, from the basis and from the most elementary articulations (RAUBER, 2003). Certainly, it is a patient and day-by-day construction, a constantly renewed and transformed process focused on the present, once this is the reality to be transformed.

In Argentina, for instance, there are almost fifteen thousand people working in recovered companies (organizations that went under and were occupied by employees, as a way to secure their jobs) that are managed by workers. There are currently more than two hundred companies under the management of employees, from hotels to pottery and clothing factories, to printing and transportation companies, among others. Of course, most initiatives for self-management by workers of these companies were due to their production needs and maintenance of life itself, since the alternative was unemployment. That is, most of these initiatives took place during the national economic crisis of 2001, when the unemployment rate reached almost 30% and the poverty rate reached more than 50% of the population. It is important to note, however, that this was an alternative management model which has been working since then.

In these organizations, best known as cooperatives, the people who work on production line are the same people who are in charge of the administration work and direction of the company. At *Fabrica Sin Patrón* (FASINPAT), former *Zanon*, the largest pottery factory in Latin America, self-management by workers means that the organizational community makes their own decisions, especially those related to planning and the production process. One of the biggest challenges of FASINPAT is to keep the business running without professionally trained managers, without hierarchical organization. Namely, at its foundation in 2001, FASINPAT had 250 workers, and today there are 470 cooperative members. When they occupied the factory, they started up producing five thousand square meters of ceramics per month and soon succeeded in doubling production to fourteen thousand square meters of ceramics per month. In 2008, FASINPAT produced 400 thousand square meters of ceramics per month, a record for the worker control of the factory (TRIGONA, 2009).

Also, one should count on the real participation of the subjects as it is related to social practice, concrete actions generated in the struggles, movements and organizations. Participation is the building block conquered by the subjects once the organization of the social transformation should be collective rather than individual according to Gramscian. In fact, those who believe in changing reality through the participation of the individual, work together with them and not "for" them.

Participation is here understood not as a *gift*, since it would not be self-promoting; but as a tutored participation depending on the donor's whims. He has the power to set the space allowed. *It is not understood as a concession,* because it is not a residual or secondary phenomenon of social politics, but one of its fundamental axles; it would only be a quick way to darken the character of the conquest of hide the need of the dominant party to compromise. *It is not understood as something pre-existing,* because the participation space does not simply come out of the blue and it is not the first step either (DEMO, 1996, p.18).

One might then understand, as Mészáros (2004) points out that the central issue is therefore related to the need to overcome the hierarchical antagonism and in this respect, the inevitable radical restructuring is to develop a qualitatively different form of organizing.

> The recent history shows clearly that postponing the struggle to overcome human alienation and the beginning of the necessary changes to make it, will hinder and throw away the possibility of liberation rather than help it. The real distinction is not to take power or not. The logic is not everything or nothing. […] The transformation will never come true unless it starts building completely upon the present, the resistances, the struggles and the daily constructions of the new, in all spheres where it takes place (RAUBER, 2005, p.34).

Therefore, the development and strengthening of self-managing organizations or horizontal organizations would be the other strategy. Then the main challenge would be to put concrete proposals into practice so that all subjects involved actually participate in such organization. Actions would be grounded on the Gramscian construction, an uninterrupted construction based on self-managing conceptions, that is, encouraging human emancipation.

However, before dealing with these practices, let's look at the hegemony way of organizing: bureaucratic or hierarchical organizations.

Vertical Organizational Structures – hierarchism

To those capable of governing, gold was added to their composition. That's why they are more precious; to the assistants, silver; iron and bronze to the farmers and other craftsmen. That's the way Plato simply refers to the "creation of a town", as those who are eligible to rule it and those who will be ruled. According to the philosopher, to each and every man only one art should be given, the one he was born for and which he will exercise throughout his life, excluding the others (PLATÃO, 2004). In fact, he was dealing with the essence of heteromanagement, trying to naturalize relations of domination through "divine" determinism, which he deemed necessary to maintain a certain order.

To put it more clearly:

> To order and obey are not only inevitable conditions but also convenient. As a matter of fact, some beings are made to command or be commanded since their birth and there are several types of commanders and subordinates (the authority is better when exercised over better subordinates; for example, to command a human being is better than command a wild animal, a labor is better done by better assistants, and when a man orders and the other obeys we   may say there is an achievement) because in all compound things where a plurality of parts, be it continued or discontinued, is combined to make a whole, there will always be someone ordering and someone obeying; this peculiarity of living beings is present in them as a result of nature in its whole (ARISTÓTELES, 1988, p. 19).

I believe that it was based on this artificially built myth, which says that some were born to command and others to be commanded, that society was greatly built the way we know it today. In other words, a "gospel" preaching determinism and naturalizing relations of domination to maintain the order and *status quo*. A widely known model, running most organizations to these days is a structure based on Weber's bureaucratic way of organizing where relations of domination take place mainly due to knowledge.

According to Weber (2002), in modern time, work organized bureaucratically is superior, since work organized by collegiate departments provokes clashes, takes too long and demands too much. A fully developed bureaucratic mechanism compares to other organization exactly the same way a machine compares to non-mechanical ways of production.

> Above all, bureaucratization offers the great possibility of putting the principle of specialization of administrative roles into practice (…) The "objective" fulfillment of tasks mainly means the fulfillment of tasks according to "calculable rules" and "without any relationship with people". "Without relating to people" is also the word of command in the market and all enterprises with economic interests (…) As for the "calculable rules", their specific nature is welcomed by capitalism, which thrives as bureaucracy is "dehumanized" and love, hatred and all rational and irrational elements are eliminated from official businesses (WEBER, 2002 p. 151).

According to Weber (2002) modern bureaucracy works the following specific way:

I.   It rules a certain organization according to regulations, that is, laws or administrative norms.

    1.   Regular activities necessary to attain the goals of the structure are distributed in a fixed way as official duties.

    2.   The authority to give orders necessary for the fulfillment of duties is distributed in a stable way, being set forth by the norms related to the means of coercion that might be available to clerks and authorities.

3.   Methodical measures are taken for the regular and continuous fulfillment of these duties and only qualified people are employed according to the rules.

In the private domain, these 3 elements constitute the bureaucratic administration, and actually this kind of bureaucracy only develops fully in the "most advanced institutes of capitalism" (WEBER, 2002, p.138). In these sense, Misoczky, Oliveira e Passos (2004) point out that heteromanagement is a characteristic of hierarchized, bureaucratic societies, ruled by relations of domination and inequality. Therefore, one may understand that capitalism is a historic, peculiar form of social heteromanagement in addition to the way of production.

II. The principles of post hierarchy and levels of authority mean a system strictly ordained in terms of command and subordination.

III. The administration of a modern job is based on written documents, and in principle, there's separation between private space and organization space, much like the money and organizational equipment are separated in private life.

IV. The bureaucratic administration usually requires a specialized a thorough training.

V. When the job is completely developed, the activity demands full working capacity of the employee.

VI. The performance of the job follows general rules that can be learnt.

It all results from the position of the employee in the following:
1.   The position of a job is a profession; it is a duty in its nature and does not establish any personal relationship, which determines the internal structure of its relationship.
2.   As for the employee's personal position, he usually intends to gain specific social esteem, compared to the managed ones. His social position is guaranteed by the norms referring to the occupied hierarchy. In contrast to private companies, the position of a clerks in public bureaucracies is for life.

At last, as Weber (2004) points out,

a bureaucracy, once fully achieved, belongs to social complexes that are difficult to be destroyed. Bureaucratization is a specific means to transform a class action into a rationally ordained associative action. As an instrument of transformation of relations of domination into association relations, it has been, therefore, a first rate means of power for the bureaucratic apparatus because a well-planned and ordained associative action is superior to any mass or class action. Wherever the bureaucratization of the administration has been fulfilled it is almost impossible to break the relations of domination (WEBER, 2004, p. 222).

In short, the bureaucratic model, which provides the support to the way organizations are traditionally set up, is based on the hierarchical structure and the division of labor expressing the duality between the person who designs the planning and the one who performs it. Everything organized and based on heteromanaging model, that is, a model of management in which the bases of power are rooted in coercion and legal authority. This is the usual way of organizing dominant in organizations and emphasized in organizational studies.

On the other hand, another type of "copartnership" may also be thought of in the organization based on the bureaucratic model, i.e., the co-management or co-decision. According to Méndez and Vallota (2005) such model is developed to

meet the urgent need for new ways of organizing and avoiding that any power be conducted to the workers.

> Co-management is a model of participation characterized by an equal composition of institutions, especially in terms of decision making. Other words, co-management is a form of participation, i.e., take part in something. However, to take part in something, in this case, means to accept a pre-existing hierarchy in the company, factory or society, allowing workers to have access to the management of something that actually does not belong to them. In management we intelligently give way to the absolute power to conciliate or overcome conflicts between employees and owners, but undoubtedly we do not question the boss: the capital, be it private or state-owned, never the workers (MENDEZ; VALLOTA, 2005, p. 3-4).

Here again, the company's goals are not being called into question, because since profit is the main goal, on its behalf the hierarchical organization is reasserted under a different nomenclature. Actually, as Faria (1985, p. 63-5) points out, co-management cannot be seen as a necessary step for the elimination of authoritarianism in the organizations. The relations of power established under co-management are settled in the various strategies of cooptation and involvement of workers in the mechanism of the capitalist management of the production process. The heteromanaging model is kept under the participation disguise and oftentimes the word self-management is used to minimize a probable rejection to a certain model and at the same time legitimate it.

An example of this model, which tries to confuse self-management and the so-called co-management with a heteromanaging form is working in Argentina, in the Province of San Luis. They are the Experimental Schools or better known as "Self-managed Schools". Let's see how they work (FELDFEBER, 2003).

a. They are non-state public organizations. They are public because they are free, financed by the State and open to all students; they are non-state organizations because somehow there's a decentralization, i.e., the community may define the educational project according to their needs.

b. Teachers are hired the same way the private sector does, so the State runs like a company.

c. The self-management system of these schools was implanted via decree (nº 2.682, as of 1999). It is a policy of the Argentina State based on the top-down logic.

Therefore, the State finances these schools according to the number of students enrolled.

It may be needless to say that the name "self-managed Schools" is wrong. However, there are at least 9 schools with this name in Argentina.

Note: this model is a North-American invention known as charter schools. The rules are the same.

Also, it is important to point out that heteromanaging is described, prescribed and analyzed as a major practice in organizational theory. One can observe that the heteromanagement operates as a tool and has among its functions the role to emphasize the need for a duality between the one who organizes and the organized, naturalizing the relations of dominations, hierarchical relations, that permeate the organizational and social structure. Although its role in double, the end is the same.

The over-refinement of Wilde (1998) explains what happens once heteromanagement is authoritarianism *per se* and every authority is completely degrading: it degrades those who exercise it and degrades those who suffer its effects. When used with certain kindness and it is accompanied by prizes and rewards, it is terribly demoralizing.

In this case, people seem to be less aware of the terrible pressure they are submitted to, and go about their lives feeling a strange comfort, like tamed animals

without realizing that their way of thinking is probably the way other people think, living according to other people's standards as if they were wearing other people's clothes and never their own.

To sum up, like Motta (1986, p. 44) states, "bureaucracy is essentially competitive and for this reason its ethics complies with the capitalist spirit". To put it more clearly, "bureaucracy makes itself known as institutionalized power reflecting all its characteristics: it is conservative, possessive and alienating" (MOTTA, 1981, p. 37).

However, a question could be asked: wouldn't it be necessary to have a way of organizing rationally based on the bureaucratic model, i.e., adapting the means to the intended goals so as to guarantee maximum efficiency to these goals? Yes, but an interesting confusion may occur. "In order to pursue its goals, any human group organizes itself. But bureaucracy is different: it is based on a structure of control, with immunities and privileges. Bureaucracy, "on behalf of the organization", uses and abuses its immunities and privileges while exercising power over the organized ones" (TRAGTENBERG, 2004, p. 210).

As mentioned before, a bureaucracy, once thoroughly achieved, belongs to social complexes that are different to destroy and wherever the bureaucratization of the administration has been fulfilled, it is about impossible to break the relations of domination.

According to Tragtenberg (1980, p.141), Weber does not deny the role of bureaucracy in its necessary function, but he fights its absolute rule over society, once bureaucratic action, rationally when limited to a certain sphere, becomes irrational when extended over all the society through the mechanisms of the State.

Horizontal Organizational Structures as a Possibility

> Based on this, it is crucial that we think of a tool, a political organization, institutional instances, totally different from the ones we know (all children of a mechanical conception) that: do not intend to substitute the activities of the people and their organizations for a pro-popular power and do not consider themselves as the means of expression of a collective will supposedly unified and neither as the executors of this will and do not consider themselves as the incarnation of a class conscience or ethics of the workers and definitely abandon coercion and the police instinct and do not operate over the daily existence of the people and their organizations and give support to social trust participation and organized coordination and turn the emancipation goals into a real and concrete form of emancipation unifying the discourses and emancipating practices without dominating (MAZZEO, 2005, p. 106-7).

Paraphrasing Rauber (2003), I then ask: how to construct alternatives from the bottom? Or Mazzeo (2005): What to do?

Bolivia, for example, has proposed responses by implementing the system called *Buen Vivir* or *Vivir Bien en Comunidad.* Such system emerged from the social struggles of indigenous peoples, built in conjunction with the social movements of peasant and urban workers. This system differs from others in that it has a different conception of development and progress. It is not the kind of development linked to quantitative data of the country's economy, which hardly ever reaches the outskirts. The implementation of *Buen Vivir* integrates political, social, cultural and ethical matters, as well as economic issues. This is directly related to the struggle to eradicate poverty, the ownership of energy and water resources (the latter had been privatized and then renationalized, since this fact provoked to uprisings in Bolivia on the grounds that most of the population ran out of water due to their inability to pay very high fees charged by the private sector), with access to decent health and education. So, it is an action plan that unifies in equal importance the paths of development and the ways of eradicating poverty, inequality and social exclusion, and democratization. The central issue is that "you cannot live well if others live precariously". The decision-making processes are thus made explicit.

The collectivities of each community are subjects capable of decision and action, perceiving the horizontal organizational structures as a comparative advantage in relation to vertical organizations. In order for all groups to effectively participate in government, assemblies are held in the communities, districts and cities. The decisions made by the assemblies are accepted by the government, and therefore the assemblies have become one of the pillars for the horizontal organizational structure, for building self-managed organizations, and thus the real participation of individuals, for example, in the implementation of literacy plans, construction of infrastructure in areas that were previously neglected, among others. Sure, not everything is perfect, but Bolivians are seeking development in conjunction with an organizational practice that is more horizontal and less vertical (RAUBER, 2010).

I start to agree that it may sometimes seem utopian and even magical to some (the fatalists, of course!) to transform reality, as in the discourse of inevitability of the hierarchical organization. As Freire (1996, p. 19-20) points out: "the fatalist, immobilizing ideology is on the loose in the world. With post-modernity airs it insists on convincing us that we can do nothing against social reality. History and culture become 'almost natural'".

Now I begin to talk against this discourse. I want to talk about a culture of resistance, a practical and collective construction, the first step towards the autonomy, emancipation and deliverance of subjects while individuals and collectivities that conduct themselves without directors. As Luxemburgo already pointed out (1985, p. 39), the only subject with the managing role is the collective I of the subordinate class who resolutely claims the right to commit the mistakes and learn the dialectics, of history and currently claims right to constitute their organizations as a necessary condition for a dignifying life. As Flores emphasizes (2005, p. 98-100), social movements resort to self-managing practices to start solving some of their most urgent problems such as unemployment, health, housing, education, but mainly trying to build another culture, another, another subjectivity, different social relationships, another society through cooperation in order to rescue the integrity and dignity and even the negated identity of the socially excluded.

In Argentina, at the time of the crisis in 2001, some community restaurants were created in some neighborhoods; they were known as *comedores* ("feeders") and provided access to food, so that people could ensure the satisfaction of their basic needs. Community vegetable gardens were built to provide vegetables to the community restaurants; everyone in the community would contribute with however much they could and the food was prepared, normally by women, so that everyone could have access to at least one meal a day. In some of the neighborhoods, were created networks of small factories, bakeries and community restaurants, all using the services of the community members. Overall, they tried to produce in their own neighborhood and manage their organizations, especially using horizontal organizational practices (DI FIORI, 2003). Some of these restaurants still exist today, given their viability, which was afforded by the horizontal organizational practices among workers, i.e., by the self-management regime. Some of these projects are financed with social plans distributed by the government, such as bakeries, factories producing shoes and clothing, home gardens, and the community restaurants themselves. In these cases, the community organization uses those social plans to develop their own projects, also managed by the community.

Organizing not from top to bottom, and outwards but from bottom to top and inwards (BAKUNIN, 1980). Organized labor starting from the abandonment and rejection of all myths and fake conscience (worship charismatic chiefs, nationalism, patriarchalism, faith in the rationality of hierarchy), because the pre-condition of human freedom is the knowledge of everything that limits it. In this sense, authentic self-awareness implies the subjugation of the chronic schizophrenia state in which most people live, struggling to maintain forms of convincing, totally incompatible among themselves. Authentic self-awareness implies the production of a basic coherence in which the relations between means and ends are clearly stated (TRAGTENBERG, 1987, p. 27).

Such organization should be based on full autonomy, full independence and therefore full responsibility of individuals and groups. Starting from a free agreement among them, believing in cooperation as a moral duty to fulfill all commitments and never contradict the program accepted. Actions stem from these bases like instruments able to give real life to the organization. Thus, the organization will be free from all authoritarianism despite the imperfections of, because it does not make the law nor imposes on others its own decisions (MALATESTA, 1927).

In *Cooperativa La Juanita*, located in Argentina, an organization created by the *Movimiento de Trabajadores Desocupados* (MTD) of *La Matanza* (Movement of Unemployed Workers of La Matanza), where I conducted a research with the consent of its members, I noticed that decision-making is done through consensus among the members. The people of MTD refer to their activities as "productive" or "educational". The activities that are part of what they call the production complex are the following: bakery, tailoring, screen printing, publishing. The school (education for youth and adults, technical education) and drama activities are part of the educational complex. Each of theses complexes have a general coordinator, and each project has a coordinator; also, there are administrative coordinators in charge of a vast amount of matters. However, these coordinators merely carry out what was decided by the MTD collectivity (assembly). During the research period, I attended all assemblies and I never saw a vote. The decisions were indeed made by consensus. The meetings lasted for hours and, if no consensus were reached, another meeting was scheduled for the following day. The use of consensus in decision making is one of most significant practices of the MTD of La Matanza. Therefore, everyone is aware of the decision and is involved in the realization of what was decided.

When the issue is urgent, for example, and concerns one of the cooperative enterprises, though everyone is called to be aware of what is happening, it is the coordinator of that project, supported by a Commission, who makes the decision. For instance, the supplier of tailoring cuts, with which the cooperative produces and exports shirts, lost its main employee in charge of cutting the pieces. The supplier is a recovered company and, along with the MTD of La Matanza, had financed the training of two people for that type of tailoring cut – one from the recovered company and another from the MTD, who was one of the tailoring coordinators. With her consent, the Steering Committee immediately decided that she would work at that company, in another town, for a few days until solved the problem. The other members of the MTD of La Matanza were called to a meeting on the same day and the coordinator of that project, after reporting the fact, informed the decision. In Bolívia, a form of organizing the collective action is the Multitud Form, which gets pretty close to the anarchist self-management. According to Linera (2001), it is characterized by a rather flexible organized net, with a solid and permanent axle of agglutination able to summon, command and mobilize a large number of citizens. It results in an assemblage of collective individuals, an association in which each attendee does not speak for himself but represents a collective local entity to which he must report his actions, decisions and words.

The Group Autonomia (1997) for example, self-called as an autonomous collective libertarian, whose goal is to boost and expand the social practices of a struggle for a free and equal society. For this reason, it repels the hierarchical division and combats authority by all means. The division between rulers and performers is overcome by direct democracy. Direct democracy, as a form of managing several collective activities, has the assembly in its base, maximum decision-making organ, which elects (for a mandatory term) and revokes (anytime) delegates for a certain role. Despite being the maximum decision-making organ, the general assembly, does not impose any directions.

Minorities are free to discuss decisions that do not agree with provided that they do not impede the directions. The circulation of information is necessary to do the work smoothly as well as the free expression of several opinions and/or currents of libertarian and autonomous anticapitalist thought. The coordination of individuals,

groups organization composing the net is also carried out by a coordination committee, alternating and formed by elected and revocable delegates (anytime) by the general assembly. Most importantly, the role of general sectors (coordination committees, specific committees, etc.) is to gather information and inform the net so that everybody may be well prepared to discuss and make decisions whenever necessary. This way the authoritarian scheme in which information ascends and decisions descend is subverted.

It is important to point out that this type of organization will only become reality if all participants fulfill all duties assumed in accordance with the decisions shared. Consequently, while it acknowledges the rights to independence, free opinion, individual freedom and imitative of each member it requires them to assume organizational fixed duties the performance of shared decisions (MHAKNO *et al*., 1926). Therefore, what is rejected, according to Walter (s/d) is not the organization, but the institutionalization of the organization, the establishment of a special group whose role is to organize the others because it would harden and close itself and fall prey of a bureaucracy, becoming an instrument of a class, the expression of authority rather than a coordinating link to the society.

Malatesta (1927) says that the organization is nothing but cooperation and solidarity; it is a natural condition of social life, an indisputable fact for everyone, the human society in general or a group of people with a common goal.

In Guinea-Bissau, at the time of that country's independence from Portugal, for instance, there were very significant self-managing experiences in education, health, justice, production and distribution, with the "people's stores". In the case of education, at schools in Guinea-Bissau, teachers and students, at first, were called to understand their own process of work, education and school maintenance, which had been previously done by Portugal. In its new organization, a self-sufficient and self-managed model was adopted, which resulted in a process of combining work and education in schools. Teachers and students began to participate in productive activities that would maintain the school: they would learn how to plant fruits and vegetables from farmers and teach them something in return, without failing to accomplish all the other school tasks. Productive work was integrated to the ordinary school activities in order to combine work and study, so that work would become a source of study, in conjunction with it. This experience, besides demonstrating the possibility of self-sufficiency and self-management in a school, as they were systematized and deepened, also showed that "it is increasingly possible to derive from productive activity the syllabus of a number of school subjects, which in the traditional system are only verbally "transferred", if that. At a certain point, you no longer study to work or work to study; you study as you work" (FREIRE, 1978, p. 25).

Of course there were difficulties, such as the resistance of students who did not accept the idea of using their hands; and there were material difficulties, such as the lack of transportation; but the experiences were quite positive, among which we could highlight the following: "work on Sunday mornings, on ranches and farms in the state, with 120 students graduating from high school in Bissau. Participation of students in the 2nd and 3rd year of high school in Bissau in productive activities. Gardens made by students of a large number of primary schools in the capital". It is also interesting to note that "before and after trips to the field to participate in productive activities, the students discussed a number of aspects relating to that practice with the agricultural experts, who always accompanied them on visits." The assessment seminars, held in each trip back from the field, would confirm, deepen or correct the view of some point discussed in the preparatory meetings. The farmers who were visited by the urban students also learned something from them. This was a unique experience in which teachers, students and community took the school management and, indeed, learned to manage it by working together, in school activities to productive activities (FREIRE, 1978, p. 26).

What one perceives is that the man cannot live alone. He does not want that because he cannot become a real man and satisfy his material and moral

needs without the cooperation of his peers. In this sense, it seems that those who do not "organize" themselves are "organized" by the others. Thus, considering the "organization" as something inevitable and quoting Bourdieu (1998), the "organization" is also a "game" that the social action cannot avoid and since we are all subject to some kind of organization, to the "game", he who does not play it is taken by the flow just like a "happy wreck", which is "played" and manipulated, i. e., organized by the others. The whole question, I insist, lies on the act of organizing. Emancipation depends on organization, but I believe that the latter cannot be based on hierarchical models nor authoritarian principles. Therefore, it seems to me that the main task for those who want to transform reality is to start out from their own organizations.

In this sense, in principle, I believe that self-management is the management of production means in an organization deprived of any hierarchical structure, coherent with the principles of freedom and equality in which all human beings, at least in that organization have equal rights to participate. Such organization would be deprived of any "hierarchical structure", but organized and well-structured. So that everyone can participate. It does not mean that organizations are totally deprived of any structure of organizational standards. In fact, the existence of a formal instance where collective decisions are made hinders the creation of organisms that would make the self-managing organization impossible. Therefore, the lack of structures in the development of self-management could favor "some individuals" who feel they have the right to decide on behalf of the others.

According to Freeman (1970), any group of people who gather for any reason, anytime, will inevitably get structural somehow. The structured may be flexible and it may vary over with time. It may distribute power and resources equally or unequally, but it is established despite the skills, personalities and intentions of the subjects involved. The "lack of structure" may become a way of disguising power. Therefore, the rules concerning decision-making cannot be known only by a few because those who not known them could be prevented from the exercise of power. Thus, the structure must be explicit or implicit so that everyone may have the chance to get involved in a group and participate in the activities. Decision-making rules should be overt and available to everyone and this can happen only if they are formalized. However, the normalization of a group structure does not mean the imposition of a heteromanaging model and neither does it mean that the existence of a certain organizational structure is inherently bad as some people may think.

The structure is established to facilitate the participation of the subjects, which in self-management means a decision-making attitude, involvement in all aspects of the organization, from planning to execution, commitment and immediate responsibility towards the internal and external organizational community. Therefore, it is understood that the responsibility of each subject is *sine qua non* condition to achieve a self-managed organization.

> Responsibility is the obligation to answer for one's own actions or for something we are responsible for. It carries two aspects: individual and collective. The Collective responsibility obliges the individual to answer for his actions before the group while this is supposed to answer for the individual. There is no opposition between collective and individual responsibility. They complete one another and expand from the social point of view. When a group or class makes a decision emanating from practical principles, approving an action, no member of the group may omit himself or break up from the group causing trouble to attain the intended goal. Everyone is co-responsible. Responsibility is collective and social. The decision, the practice is collective and so is the responsibility (CUBEROS, p.3, 2001).

To construct this organization is not an easy task. The first step is to slowly start making collective decisions in terms of deadlines and internal work. This involves the use of some tools, such as: basic working concepts (process, classes, people, ideology, system, domination…); internal working criteria (at all levels, for all types of jobs) highlighting characteristics defined by the group (e. g. responsibility,

organization, autonomy, commitment, self-discipline, capacity of formulation and persuasion, ethics, solidarity, fraternity, comradeship…); levels of participation; qualification of the group to work as an organization (enhancing and improving mechanisms and internal instances, respectively the agreements and overall policy of the organization), bearing in mind that all tasks carry the same importance and the assignment of executive tasks does not imply any privilege. Thus, the higher then level of commitment, the greater the self-managing capacity, internally or externally (FAG, 1995).

In *Cooperativa La Juanita*, dealt with above, all cooperative members are in charge of one specific task, and each activity coordinator is accountable for a sector, supported by the people he/she coordinates. It is noteworthy that, though each is responsible for performing a specific task, all tasks are monitored by the coordinator and by their own colleagues, who may return a work considered to be poorly done, including work done by the coordinator. Everyone monitors each other's tasks. However, people working on different activities cannot interfere with each other's tasks. However, during the weekly assemblies, all coordinators account for the activities under their responsibility, all cooperative members may interfere with all matters, ask for explanations and make suggestions.

What the self-managed organization seeks is the "extinction of non-legitimate recipes, i.e., the ones not produced by socially useful physical or intellectual work useful. In other words, it involves a deep economic transformation, centralizing economy not on speculation and profit, but on labor and product for everyone" (SANTILLAN, 1980, p.57-58). According to the same author, parasitism should be suppressed so that life would be organized in such a way that those who can work and never do, would not have ways of living off the others.

For example, in Argentina, some self-managing practices have been put into action among the inhabitants of Mosconi, Vespúcio and Cornejo. People are organized in a Unión de Trabajadores Desocupados (UTI) which manages the enterprises of all the members and at the same time it is supervised by the participants of various projects. Secondly, the organization proposes a coordinate and cooperative use of equipment, which is produced and repaired in the community, as far as possible. In addition, they cultivate a vegetable garden for the community and other larger agricultural crops. There are also organizations for the production of bricks, recycling, welding and hardware, sewing, etc. Agriculture represents a first-level tool for the community in the self-management strategy once it guarantees the material reproduction of life itself. It is the organization that deci-des which jobs should be done, in which projects to invest (school, health care, hygiene, housing), always seeking dignifying collective solutions to the material reproduction of life, intertwining methods of struggles with the development of productive community projects (GIARRACCA; WAHREN, 2005). Following the example of UTD regarding collective decision making, decisions involving each task (vegetable garden, recycling, bricks, etc.) must be made by workers that know how to perform that job. However, when a decision has to do with the organizations, then it must be taken by all members of UTD, meaning that the decision-makers must have all pertinent information, which characterizes the role of representations of each group.

Experiences are plenty. Rauber (2005) argues that a lot of points must be taken into consideration. Propositions vary a lot, once human beings, victims of the hegemonic system, present their basic needs to keep the material conditions to reproduce their own life. In other words, the first step therefore would be "the productions of means allowing them to meet those needs, the production of their own material life, a historical fact, a fundamental requirement of all history that must be met every single moment to keep man alive" (MARX; ENGELS, 2004, p. 53).

Therefore, according to Rauber (2005), the propositions to be presented in the Latin-American context range from the organizations dealing with emergency issues to those leading to a radical and systematic transformations of reality, as we can see next:

- Organizations dealing with social emergency or survival which are marked with urgency and transitoriness, i.e., are not necessarily guided to a radical and systematic transformation of reality;
- Organizations with reivindicative-sectorial proposals, dealing with fights for better wages, workers rights, sexual freedom etc, i.e., they are reivindicative but not anti nor alter-systemic;
- Organizations with "parabanes" proposals, consisting of several social actors who articulate around a common issue, for instance, the elimination of poor countries debts, international law to control environment pollution, etc. Although they do not intend to change the system and come in a secondary plane, they are meaningful for life maintenance;
- The pragmatic-alternative proposals, due to their questioning and transforming character regarding the logic of the capital, constitute the basis for the definition of an immediate alternative program with a clear strategic-alternative dimension seeking the transformation of the irrational character of the system with proposals that question the system itself, for example, the fight for land, work, water, the construction of other pedagogical proposals.

The Centro de Formación de Cultura Comunitaria (CEFoCC) do Movimiento de Trabajadores Desocupados, for example, came into existence to meet the survival needs of the workers. The project initially predicted the opening of community restaurants where all members could have a meal, whether or not they had contributed with same food. Meanwhile, some individuals were supposed to look after the children of the community and others took to the streets to try to get resources and other sources of food for the group and so they managed to build a precarious bakery by the group and for the group. Later, after the basic needs are met, the movement turns to long-term proposals such as schools for their children, sewing workshops etc.

Therefore, as far as these proposals are concerned it is fundamental to point out that organizing in a different way is feasible, i.e., leading life in a different way is feasible. In this sense, in order to understand the non-hetero-managing organizational practices it is urgent to understand self-management and the participation of individuals in the self-managed social construction.

Therefore, self-management presents at least the following characteristics:

I.   The organizational structure is horizontal;
II.   The work is organized from the bottom, and upwards in the form of counsels;
III. The division between managers and workers is overcome by direct democracy;
IV.   The assembly is the maximum decision-making organ;
V.   The Coordination of individuals, group or organizations is performed through a coordinating committee, alternating and made up of elected delegates, revolble at any time by a general assembly;
VI.   The goal of the general organs (coordinated committees, specific commissions, etc.) is to gather information and pass it down to all the organization so that everyone can be well-informed to discuss and make decisions whenever necessary;
VII. All subjects must assume fixed organizational duties in order to perform the decisions shared by everyone;
VIII. Decision-making rules (decision process) must be formalized in order to be openly known and available to everyone;
IX.   The decision is collective, the practice is collective and so is the responsibility;
X.   The expertise of individuals must be respected in the work organization;
XI.   Participation, is demanded in decision-making;

In this sense, self-management does not mean the inexistence of organization, but an organization whose bases take into account the real and responsible participation of the subjects in organizational decisions as a condition

sine qua non throughout all the organizing practices or organizational processes. Such participation should be understood as a daily practice, taking part in the group, and taking a conscientization stand before the constructions and choices proposed by the group itself and more broadly by the society in general since the self-managing proposal necessarily involves emancipation practices for the human being and not for a specific group.

Therefore, self-management is based on the construction of power starts from the bottom, i.e., among other things it is based on the coherence between means and ends, the self-construction of the subjects, the self-organization. It does not start from a rupture, but manages itself along the entire process. It requires a conscientious participation and the good will of all social actors in the process; it is not created magically or spontaneously. The participation and the organization of the subjects cannot be imposed instantly nor by degree. It is important to construct the collective actor with his organization and proposals, and this takes time. Above all, it is a change in politics, the politician and this power. It is not about going to the suburbs preaching a popular education. It is not only about implementary participative processes at the basis. It is about something deeper, more comprehensive, articulated with a process of appropriation of the transformation by each one of the actors playing this role. There are no recipes and neither guarantees, but the only possibility is to advance and transform (RAUBER, 2003, p. 12-18).

In this sense, the self-managing organization is compatible with the proposals of the movements of emancipation movements, once "the organization", the process of conscientization and struggling are not special phases, mechanically separated in time, but are distinct aspects of the same process "(LUXEMBURGO, 1985, p.16). It might take a long time, but it is a process that fosters the effective participation of human beings in the construction of their on history. Also, it is the basis for human emancipation being gradually built from the bottom, without imposition, rethinking the meaning of power, i.e., "command by obeying".

> To command by obeying means to rethink the meaning of power, it is not an ethical proposal but one that breaks up with the logic of power as we know it. Evidently, breaking up with the rules of power involves a fight from above, against the lords of power and exploitation. At the same time, it is a fight among us down here, breaking the domination in our families, work and schools; a fight between men and women, adults and youngsters, among races, in our organizations and groups, in our daily relationships. It involves a new relationship that allows the construction of a new power, a self-ruling and self-determining power that makes bottom-up decisions (RAMIREZ, p.5, 2005).

As highlights Ramírez (2005) it isn't about take by assault the system, but deconstruct it and, in this process, experiencing to draw, to dream with an alternative system. Convincing, not conquering, constructing a counter-hegemony that, in this case, is the horizontal organizational practice or the self-management.

Some Final Considerations

I believe that Gennari (2000) clearly expresses this kind of construction.

> The dream is like a star where we walk to holding on to our hopes that this dream will come true and move people will perceive that the world can be different and that this change depends only on us. The problem is, some people only look at the star hoping to get those, without takes any steps to join efforts and without transforming this dream into a form invincible resistance. They just look at the sky remembering the happy moments, waiting for someone to take the star or by a sleight of hand bring it closer to them. They get tired of waiting too long, and eventually they give up and even lose their dignity, their feeling of rebellion and resistance. The star seems to be farther and farther and fades away blinding their eyes. Stranded, they stay alone and realize it was just a dream. Meanwhile, others try to make their dream come true looking around for possibilities, setting

o&s - Salvador, v.17 - n.55, p. 585-604 - Outubro/Dezembro - 2010
www.revistaoes.ufba.br
599

goals, gathering tools to reach it, facing obstacles and making tomorrow a better day (GENNARI, 2000, p. 1).

Surely I understand that self-management is not a rose garden, but it is the beginning of a historical process through several phases, each one counting on the participation of subjects so that gradually the political super-structures of domination would convert into infra-structures of democratization, and the economic and political self-management would become the government of the things but not the control over the individuals. In short, I do not believe that organizing ourselves will inevitably end up generating oppression and a source of privileges, although some have irresponsibly stated that oppression is the unavoidable fate of every organization, as is emancipation would not have to organize itself (MAZZEO, 2005, p.105). However, one must know who is in charge of the organization, i.e., "the question is not only make more bread, but to know who manages the bakery" (TRAGTENBERG, 1987, p.24). For when individuals are indeed the subject of the act of organizing, i.e., when they are not merely organized by a few, the purposes of this organization are determined by these individuals.

Therefore, no matter how the forms of organization are defined concerning self-management, they are, after all, forms of emancipation (NEGT, 1984, p. 36). Self-management is therefore a method and a goal. Its purpose lies in itself, i.e., the only way to attain self-management is by carrying out self-management. Self-management is an attempt to modify the social organization and the political notion, sharing all the matters with everyone, directly or indirectly (MENDEZ; VALLOTA, 2005). Consequently, self-management is not an objective of the capitalist society, because the subordinate class will be able to manage production and generate new forms of labor organization, horizontal, equalitarian and anticapitalist organizations. As evidenced by Tragtenberg (1986), what erodes the current system, the current production system, is the creation of these organizations, because they deny the verticality of the existing bodies.

Like Marx and Engels have already pointed out (2004, p.51-52), reality may only be transformed by real acting men, generators of their own representations and ideas because these "men, as they develop their material production and material relationship, they also transform their thinking and its outcome, and consequently their own reality".

Mazzeo (2005) also insists that we must bear in mind two basic principles: conditions to transform reality are like germ cells found in daily actions and the revolutionary mentality is the result of a large practice. Thus, organizing experiences that generate social movements, the new organizational practical, also boost the awareness process and may serve as identity supports since they already express collective identities through cultural and symbolic contents clearly against hegemony. Hence, these experiences generate a solidary context that tends to overcome the dualism and alienation, that is, they may be recognized as the field of praxis to guarantee real freedom and set an adequate landmark for the construction of organizations around emancipation. Therefore, it is important to know how the organizations are "managed" and organized in their praxis, whether on the basis of domination or equal relationships.

Lastly, like Sitrin (2005, p. 34), I believe that building and keeping self-managing organizations is like building and keeping freedom. It is learning by doing and the first step is to recognize that one cannot "build something new with old tools". This new tool is self-management, which has been allowing the organizations that adopt it, especially social movements, the extinction of ancient practices that are deeply rooted, such as welfare. These horizontal, egalitarian, participatory and democratic relations have broken up with some of the strong hierarchical relations, that were also asymmetric and clientelistic, and that have continued for centuries, especially in Latin America (FLORES, 2005, p. 100), as we have seen in the examples cited throughout this text.

Finally, it is important to note that self-organization will never be a juxtaposition of individuals gregariously connected, who maintain a mechanistic

relationship. It is true that with no guidance, no discipline, no order, no decision, no goals, no tasks to accomplish and with no accountability, there is no organization, and without it, the organization itself is dissolved. None of this, however, can justify the management of people as though they are objects. Hence, leadership shall not act alone, but along with those it represents. If leadership fails to do so, if it insists on imposing orders, this will not be organization, but manipulation. The fact that leadership does not have the right to arbitrarily impose orders in the self-organization process does not mean taking a liberal position, which would lead to licentiousness. It just means that leadership in a horizontal organizational practice denies authoritarianism and licentiousness. And by doing so, it reasserts authority and freedom; it acknowledges that, if there is no freedom without authority, there is no authority without freedom either. This means, in reality, that we cannot analyze them separately, but in their relations, which are not necessarily antagonistic. It is a highly educational time, in which the subjects learn together about the real authority and freedom that they seek to establish, transforming the reality that connects them (FREIRE, 2005).

References

ARISTÓTELES. *Política*. Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília, 1988.

BAKUNIN, Michael Alexandrovich. A sociedade ou fraternidade internacional revolucionária. In: GUÉRIN, Daniel. *Bakunin*: textos escolhidos. Porto Alegre: L&PM Editores Ltda., 1980. p. 89-98.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. *O poder simbólico*. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 1998.

CUBEROS, Jaime. A organização específica – parte II. *Coletivo Luta Libertária*, São Paulo, set., 2001. Disponível em <http://www.lutalibertaria.hpg.ig.com.br/combate3.htm>. Acesso em: 12 jun. 2010.

DEMO, Pedro. *Participação é conquista*. São Paulo: Cortez, 1996.

DI FIORI, V. Paríendo nuevas prácticas. *Red de Solidariedades Rebeldes*, Buenos Aires, nov., 2003. Disponível em <http://www.solidaridadesrebeldes.kolgados.com.ar/article.php3?id_article=26>. Acesso em 18 jul. 2008.

DUSSEL, Enrique. *Ética da libertação na idade da globalização e da exclusão*. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 2002.

FAG (Federação Anarquista Gaúcha). Aspectos básicos da organização política. *Boletim Interno da FAG, Porto Alegre,* n. 0, dez. 1995. Disponível em <http://www.nodo50.org/insurgentes/textos/org/19aspbasicos.htm>. Acesso em: 12 jul. 2010.

FARIA, José Henrique. *Relações de poder e formas de gestão*. Curitiba: Criar Edições, 1985.

FELDFEBER, Myrian. La redefinición del espacio público: el caso de las escuelas autogestionadas en Argentina. *Educação e Sociedade*, v. 24, n. 84, p. 923-943, set., 2003.

FLORES, Toty. *De la culpa a la autogestión*: un recorrido del Movimiento de Trabajadores Desocupados de La Matanza. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Continente, 2005.

_____. *Cuando com otros somos nosotros*: la experiencia asociativa del MTD de La Matanza. Buenos Aires: M.T.D. Editora, 2006.

FREEMAN, Jo. The tyranny of structurelessness. *The Struggle Site*, London, dez., 1970. Disponível em <http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/hist_texts/structurelessness.html>. Acesso em: 18 jun. 2010.

FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogia da autonomia* – Saberes necessários à prática educativa. 8ª edição. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1996.

_____. *Cartas à Guiné-Bissau*: registros de uma experiência em processo. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1978.

_____. *Pedagogia do oprimido*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2005.

GENNARI, Emílio. Chiapas: as comunidades zapatistas reescrevem a história. *Zapatistas Revolution*, México, jan., 2000. Disponível em <http://www.chiapas.hpg.ig.com.br/emilio_inicio.html>. Acesso em: 19 abr. 2010.

GIARRACCA, Norma; WAHREN, Juan. Territórios em disputa: iniciativas productivas y acción política em Mosconi, Argentina. *Revista del Observatorio Social de América Latina*, Buenos Aires, n. 16, 2005. Disponível em <http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/ar/libros/osal/osal16/D16GiarraccaWahren.pdf>. Acesso em: 16 mai. 2010.

GRAMSCI, Antonio. *Concepção dialética da história.* Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Civilização Brasileira, 1978.

_____. *Os intelectuais e a organização da cultura*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1989.

GRUPO AUTONOMIA. Teses para a formação de uma rede de indivíduos, grupos e organizações autônomas. *Kaos, São Paulo,* n. 9, 1997. Disponível em <http://www.geocities.com/autonomiabvr/rede.html>. Acesso em: 18 mai. 2010.

GUIJT, I.; SHAH, M. Kaul. *The myth of community*: gender issues in participatory development. Londres: Intermediate Technology Publications, 1998.

EBEDE, Alem Seghed. Grassroots environmental organizations in the United States: a gramscian analysis. *Sociological Inquiry*, Portland/Oregon, n.75, v. 1, p. 81-108, 2005. Disponível em <http://sgboehm.googlepages.com/kebede.pdf>. Acesso em: 15 jul. 2010.

LINERA, Alvaro García. La estructura de los movimientos sociales en Bolívia. *Revista del Observatorio Social de América Latina*, Buenos Aires, n. 5, 2001. Disponível em <http://168.96.200.17/ar/libros/osal/osal5/debates.pdf>. Acesso em: 13 set. 2010.

LUXEMBURGO, Rosa. Questões de organização da social-democracia russa. In: LÊNIN, V.I.; LUXEMBURGO, Rosa. *Partido de massas ou partido de vanguarda*: polêmica Rosa/Lênin. São Paulo: Nova Stella Editorial, 1985. p. 42-45.

MALATESTA, Errico. *Anarquia e organização*. *Marxists.org*, London, set., 1927. Disponível em <http://www.marxists.org/portugues/malatesta/1927/misc/anarquia-organizacao.htm>. Acesso em: 15 fev. 2010.

MARX, K.; ENGELS, F. *A ideologia alemã*. São Paulo: Martin Claret, 2004.

MAZZEO, Miguel. *Qué [no] hacer.* Buenos Aires: Antropofagia, 2005.

MÉNDEZ, Nelson; VALLOTA, Alfredo. Utopia coletiva y autonomia individual: la perspectiva anarquista de la autogestión. *Indymidia.org*, México, out., 2005. Disponível em <www.fsa.contrapoder.org.ve/documentos/autogestion.doc>. Acesso: 24 jun. 2010.

MÉSZÁROS, István. *O poder da ideologia*. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial, 2004.

MHAKNO, Nestor; METT, Ida; ARCHINOV, Piotr; VALEVSKY, Linsky. Plataforma organizacional dos comunistas libertários. *Zabalaza.net*, África do Sul, out.,1926. Disponível em http://www.zabalaza.net/pdfs/varpams/plataforma.pdf. Acesso em: 10 jul. 2010.

MILANI, Carlos. O princípio da participação social na gestão de políticas públicas locais: uma análise de experiências latino-americanas e européias. *Revista de Administração Pública (RAP)*, n. 3, v. 42, p. 551-79, 2008.

MISOCZKY, Maria Ceci Araújo; OLIVEIRA, Romualdo Paz de; PASSOS, Rafael Pavan dos. Reflexões sobre a autogestão a partir da experiência da Cidade das Cidades. In: *Organizações & Sociedade*, edição especial, v. 11, p. 183-196, 2004.

_____; AMANTINO-DE-ANDRADE, Jackeline. Uma crítica à crítica domesticada nos estudos organizacionais. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea - RAC*, v. 9, n. 1, p. 215-233, 2005.

_____; FLORES, Rafael Kruter; BÖHM, Steffen. A práxis da resistência e a hegemonia da organização. *Organizações & Sociedade*, v. 15, n. 45, p. 181-194, 2008.

_____; MORAES, Joysi; FLORES, Rafael Kruter. Bloch, Gramsci e Paulo Freire: referências fundamentais para os atos da denúncia e do anúncio. *Cadernos EBAPE* (FGV), v. 7, p. 448-471, 2009.

MOTTA, Fernando Carlos Prestes. *Burocracia e autogestão*: a proposta de Proudhon. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1981.

_____. *Teoria das organizações*: evolução e crítica. São Paulo: Pioneira, 1986.

NEGT, Oskar. *Dialética e história*: crise e renovação do marxismo. Porto Alegre: Editora Movimento, 1984.

PLATÃO. *A república*. São Paulo: Martin Claret, 2004.

RAMÍREZ, César Enrique Pineda. 5 sonhos do zapatismo, 5 sonhos para resistência. *Midiaindependente.org*, São Paulo, jul., 2005. Disponível em <http://www.midiaindependente.org/pt/blue/2005/03/310432.shtml>. Acesso em: 28 fev. 2010.

RAUBER, Isabel. Construcción de poder desde abajo: conceptos claves. *Rebelión*, Buenos Aires, dez., 2003**.** Disponível em <www.rebelion.org/docs/4524.pdf>. Acesso em: 18 maio 2010.

_____. *Sujetos políticos*: rumbos estratégicos y tareas actuales de los movimientos sociales y políticos en América Latina. Colômbia: Ediciones desde abajo, 2005.

_____. Bolivia: una opción civilizatoria con rostro indígena. Código Rauber, Buenos Aires, ago., 2010. Disponível em <http://isabelrauber.blogspot.com/2010/08/bolivia-una-opcion-civilizatoria-con.html>. Acesso em: 13 set. 2010.

SANTILLÁN, Diego Abad de. *Organismo da revolução*: a autogestão na revolução espanhola. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1980.

SITRIN, Marina. *Horizontalidad*: voces de poder popular en Argentina. Buenos Aires: Chilavert, 2005.

TRAGTENBERG. Maurício. *Burocracia e ideologia*. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1980.

_____. *Reflexões sobre o socialismo*. São Paulo: Editora Moderna LTDA., 1986.

_____. Uma prática de participação: as coletivizações na Espanha (1936/1939). In: VENOSA, Roberto. *Participação e participações*: ensaios sobre autogestão. São Paulo: Babel Cultural, 1987. p. 21-60.

_____. *Sobre educação, política e sindicalismo*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2004.

TRIGONA, Marie. FASINPAT: a factory that belongs to the people. *ZCommunicatios.org*, Buenos Aires, abr., 2009. Disponível em <http://www.zcommunications.org/fasinpat-a-factory-that-belongs-to-the-people-by-marie-trigona>. Acesso em: 18 set. 2010.

WALTER, Nicolas. Do anarquismo. *Ateus.net*, Rio de Janeiro, s/d. Disponível em <http://www.ateus.net/ebooks/> S/d. Acesso em: 12 jul. 2010.

WEBER, Max. *Ensaios de sociologia*. Rio de Janeiro: LTC Editora, 2002.

_____. *Economia e sociedade*: fundamentos da sociologia compreensiva. Brasília: Editora da Universidade de Brasília, 2004.

WILDE, Oscar. The soul of man under socialism. 1998. *The anarchist library*, London, out., 1998. Disponível em <u>Workers Solidarity n. 53</u>. <u>http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/hist_texts/wilde_soul.html</u>>. Acesso em: 12 jul. 2010.

WOOD, Ellen Meiksins. *Democracia contra o capitalismo*: a renovação do materialismo histórico. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial, 2003.