

# **Regional development policies – are they able to reduce spatial inequalities in Brazil?**

Rainer Randolph  
Urban and Regional Research and Planning Institute  
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro

## **Abstract**

Although it could be early to evaluate the recent political and institutional changes that have taken place in Brazil, especially at the level of the State and the Federal Government, it does not seem risky to work with the hypothesis that obstacles that have already delayed approval and implementation of the National Regional Development Policy, PNDR II, elaborated since 2012, tend to increase and may ultimately lead to the abandonment of this policy. In these circumstances, the proposal advocated in this paper is that the discussion on these policies should rescue the regional development agenda at other scales and through new institutional formats. Ultimately, this essay intends to present an argument that supports this perspective by four steps. First, a deeper understanding of the meaning of the apparent "impossibility" of creating a national regional policy will be developed. The following discussion of politics is based on an articulation of three main authors, Poulantzas, Offe, and Jessop. In opting for an understanding close to Gramsci's thoughts it becomes possible, in the next step, to understand the term governance critically. Finally, the article is devoted to a critical appreciation of the conditions to concretize this neo-Gramscian conception of governance. It concludes that the "feasibility" of governance that requires the "real" inclusion of underprivileged social forces may depend on the scale at which it is being pursued. It may be a promising path to think of a "dialectical overcoming" of local power to rescue regional agendas.

## **Introduction**

The political and institutional changes that have taken place in Brazil in the last year do not inspire much confidence, in the short range, in terms of the implementation of a National Regional Development Policy (PNDR) in the country.

Even the formulation of a first National Policy during the first decade of the present century was not considered a success because, at that moment, the proposal for a PNDR despite raising "points of the utmost importance for the Brazilian regional issue. .. was not achieved in institutional terms and neither its means and instruments, necessary for its implementation" (GUIMARÃES NETO 2012, p.206). The progress that has been made in reducing regional inequalities during this period cannot be credited to a deliberate action of a regional policy. Regionally differentiated results must be attributed to sectoral policies precisely because of sectoral inequalities in the territory (income distribution, employment opportunity, credit expansion, internalization of higher education, etc.). That is, the (relative) reduction of such inequalities (BRANDÃO 2014, p.340) is due to the characteristics of implemented sectoral policies, not to a deliberate regional performance.

Even recognizing as a rather coherent proposal and result of an important process of elaboration (BRANDÃO 2014, p.339), the new effort to create a national-level regional development policy (NDRP II) from 2012 until today might have the same fate as the previous version. Not so much for the reasons aligned by Guimarães, but because of the scarcity "of political actors of weight who sustain a policy of such complexity" (BRANDÃO, 2014, p. 340).

"There have not been sufficient legitimacy and political force accumulated and consolidated to break the deadlock in the implementation of national and regional development policies that simultaneously respect and bring out our diversity, promote cultural enrichment, and tackle the abysmal underdevelopment of regions that are less favored by the poor distribution of material enrichment in relation to the richer regions".

In these words, the author acknowledges that there are no technical, financial or managerial problems that impede the implementation of the proposals of a new regional policy, but political and social circumstances (lack of forces) do not support them. In this sense, he argues that the lack of "realization" of regional development proposals cannot be attributed merely to the fault of adequacy or coherence of the instruments available for its implementation. And the problem may not only be the absence of social and political support, but the implementation of measures and instruments of politics can even be actively combated and interdicted by "archaic and conservative forces" of Brazilian society (BRANDÃO, 2014, 342).

Historical experience shows that governments that express more directly these "archaic and conservative forces" are often committed, in behalf of their influence of economic and social organization of society, to a political project of strengthen market mechanisms to the detriment of public acting and replacing agendas such as planning and development by privatization and growth.

Even if it is too early to assess the recent political changes in Brazil, it does not seem risky to assume that the obstacles mentioned above against formulation and implementation of a regional development policy will only increase and tend to abort the proposals that have been drawn up at the national level. The fate of PNDR II will be elucidative in this sense.

The position advocated in this paper is, considering the broader circumstances, that the discussion on these policies should rescue the regional development agenda at other scales and through new institutional formats. This seems they have even more importance than it had been attributed to them previously (see RANDOLPH 2015 a).

In order to show the pertinence of this argument, it will be necessary, in the next item, to elaborate a deeper understanding of the meaning of the apparent "impossibility" of creating a regional policy. This explication will be found when we try to identify the structural reasons for the supposed "absence" or "non-existence" of politics. In noticing the "non-event" of politics, as a "positive fact," it must be interpreted as socially and politically produced - not as a lack of an object of the physical-natural world that is simply not present. It is necessary to conceive this fact as something that could have happened, but it did not happen because something prevented its presence, its happening. Such an effort will require the investigation of the agents involved in this "production", its agencies, places and dynamics responsible for this (not) result – at both "sides": those who contributed to the virtuality of the event (LEFEBVRE, 1999, p.16) and those who prevent this possibility from taking place.

And more, the understanding of these processes involves equally the identification of the (complex) mechanisms that not only produce that non-events, but the processes (usually concomitant) too that "naturalize" them, ie render invisible their "social production". Something what, perhaps in analogy to the fetishism of the commodity, can be denominated a "fetichism" of decision-making.

That is, instead of analysing the explicit elements of a proposal that will not be recognized as regional policy, it is necessary to unveil the mechanisms – processes of "selectivities", as will be argued below - that prevented their "happening."

It is in the third part of the present essay, the analysis will make use of a perspective on politics, planning, government and governance, elaborated in other place (RANDOLPH 2017), which is based on a more profound debate and deliver an

explanation of the position of this text in relation to the State, its characteristics, formats, functions and functioning; many colleagues, in the context of the present debate, pointed the necessity of such endower out. Even not presenting a "theory of the State" in Randolph (2017), the approach allows the clarifying discussion about the mentions items and permit a definition how to study the so-called "Governance" in a proper way as a "neo-Gramscian governance" (see JESSOP 2004/2014).

This conception is based on an understanding of the relations between state, society and the market - and its transformation, more importantly - in the critical perspectives of authors such as Gramsci (Hence the name, see GRAMSCI 1999), Poulantzas (1981) and Offe (1981, 1984, 2006).

This critical perspective will serve, in the final part of this essay, as a reference to discuss the potentialities and limitations of projecting a "new" governance that, by enhancing the inclusion of civil society, allows at least to make visible those mechanisms of selectivity that underlie the policies and planning formulations.

In the debate on different forms of planning (LIMONAD 2014, RANDOLPH 2014a), this concern is not a new one because has been present for a long time This discussion, however, needs to be taken urgently into the field of governance because of the hegemony of neo-liberal concepts. In this sense, this essay tries to present an appreciation of the possibilities and obstacles for the inclusion of subordinate population segments in the circuits of power. Contemplating these populations, as one of the expressions of civil society, would obviously be a prerequisite for the proposal of a neo-Gramscian governance working.

Given the above-mentioned difficulties of imagining, in current contextual contexts, a format of governance at federal (federal government) level, one of the hypotheses of the current and previous works (RANDOLPH 2014b, 2015 a) is, that chances of its accomplishment might be better in other socio-spatial scales of power circuits.

### **Selective mechanisms of state institutions as producers of “non-events”**

A further discussion of the difference between absence and non-event would ultimately raise methodological and even epistemological issues (see RANDOLPH 2015a) that will not be addressed here. It is interesting, in the present context, that this is a fundamental difference regarding its nature or character: the non-event must be understood as a socially produced phenomenon. This non-event presupposes, as already mentioned above, the virtuality (potentiality) of an event based on social actions that intended its realization. That is, there were social actions that conspired for something to happen that did not happen because other actions prevented its accomplishment. In other words, the absence of a social phenomenon has been, deliberately, produced and thus signify a non-event (RANDOLPH 2015a). This is no "esoteric" question because any effort at planning, projecting, prospecting and even designing policies faces the challenge of working with these "virtualities"; but, this only happens, most of the time, as an exercise within a positivist perspective of reality.

There is a great challenge in identifying those social agents, the subjects of the actions, who have fought for a fact to happen, what created or produced this certain virtuality, such as those who opposed and managed to prevent this virtuality from becoming " real". Identification would be an almost impossible task if, in capitalist societies, there weren't certain "places" which are, tendentially, privileged for a *systematic* "production" of these non-events. The challenge then moves to the task of

finding those systematic mechanisms (social, political, economic) that are systematically responsible for this production.

As the problem presented here - the "non-event" of a regional policy - lies in the context of policy formulation, this "place" must be sought within the State itself. This will not be the only place, as shall be seen below, but certainly one that concentrates certain "structural conditions of production" of these non-events. Therefore, it is necessary to dedicate, minimally in the present work, some research and reflection, which will allow us to understand the systematic and intentionality of this production as a conceptual reference for the investigations in the current text.

Without going deeper into the trajectory of critical thinking about the (capitalist) state since the work of Marx, one can take the events of May 1968 as a reference for a new impulse for this debate focused on "the centrality of the State apparatus as a provider of stability for the system, acting to overcome the crisis, to rearrange the positions of collective subjects, to guarantee the relegitimation of their structures and to maintain the reproduction of capitalist economic relations "(MIGUEL 2014, 149).

There are two authors in the 1970s and 1980s, who became of special relevance for the current discussion. Nicos Poulantzas, who later abandoned his structuralist Althusserian position and Claus Offe, emphasizing the structural dependence of the state, the objective constraints and the imposition of preferences and political platforms for capital (private investors).

Offe (1984: 144) disagrees with other authors' critical approaches to the capitalist state that understand the state or merely as a neutral instrument (structuralists, Poulantzas) or as solely determined by the interests of the bourgeoisie (direct dominant class in the state apparatus, Miliband). In his view, Offe does not resort to special relationships between the holders of power and the bourgeoisie (elite) and does not need to appeal to "structures" or other external mechanisms for the State to take into account the rationality of the interests of capital which will guarantee its financing (MIGUEL 2014, p.150). There is a structural dependence on the State that objectively prevents the adoption of measures that affect the levels of remuneration acceptable to capital. Their disrespect causes a retraction of economic activity and risk to the financing of the State - processes that were easy to identify in Brazil in the last two years.

For now, it is shown only the pertinence of this author to the understanding of the non-events, mentioned above. In the conception of this dependence on the capitalist state of Offe (1984) lies the key to finding the possibility "of elevating, within a conceptual framework, the terms or notions of 'absence' and 'non-happening' to concepts, which allows, in turn, to transform the *empirical question* about regional politics in Brazil into a *theoretical problem* to guide the understanding of mere phenomena and appearances "(RANDOLPH 2015a).

Still, of this dependence derives what Offe calls "systemic selectivity" that originates in "institutional selectivity" and is imposed "by the organizational structures and processes of the political system," which serves both to decant a global interest of the capitalist class and to block anti-capitalist manifestations (OFFE 1984, pp. 148-50, MIGUEL 2014, p.150).

For Offe, the systematicity of different forms of selectivity is one of the fundamental characteristics of the capitalist state. He argues that the state is classist as it systematically privileges certain class interests at the expense of others. Or as the author himself says: "The structural problem of the capitalist state is that it must simultaneously practice and render invisible its class character. The operations of selection and direction of coordinating and repressive character, which constitute the

content of its class character, must be denied by a third category of selective operations of concealing character: divergent operations, that is, those that follow opposite directions "(OFFE 1984 , P. 163, emphasis added).

For Offe, the preservation of an apparent class neutrality is fundamental for class domination. In other words, the author argues that a declared class neutrality of actions (for example, especially of planning) is just an appearance. It is ensured by the selectivity processes - the systematic restriction of a space of virtualities or possibilities - through which political (classist) domination is exercised.

"This selectivity is constituted by a dialectical (circular) process: its institutionalization in certain state apparatus is both the result and the condition of the power struggle between social and political forces. In other words, the institutions themselves are the result of disputes between different political interests and their manifest distribution of that systematic selectivity. And, at the same time, these institutions constitute the very condition for the concrete exercise of the interests of those who have conquered them through the use of selectivity mechanisms: what submitted 'demands' for services will be accepted and supported and which ones do not enter in political agendas - that is, the destiny of the 'non-happening' "(RANDOLPH 2015a, emphasis added).

It is in these non-events that selectivity expresses itself as repressive: State action is not restricted to "affirmative systematic actions," but, in an almost invisible way, it represses certain demands that may be either segments of capital itself or originated from claims by the subaltern classes (labor, anti-capitalist forces). The "regulation" exercised by the state in society has this threefold aspect: the systemic selectivity itself, the repressive selectivity to block anticapitalist manifestations, and a third that is divergent. That is, the State's need to have a certain loyalty even by the members of the subordinate classes obliges governments to meet, at least partially, certain demands of them when pressed by them.

### **Different forms of producing selectivity: from government to governance**

As mentioned above, deepening of this discussion will not be possible at this time. In another work it was shown (RANDOLPH 2017) that, starting from an articulation of contributions of Poulantzas, Offe and Jessop - in this order -, it is not enough to study the basic structure of the capitalist state in its institutional architecture (constitutional / legal) and its specific organizational forms without regarding the fact that these characteristics are linked to their ("governmental") strategic capacities both within the political system itself - political society - but also in its interdependence with functional systems and the world of life - civil society.

And explicitly, referring to strategic selectivity, Jessop 2004/2014 states that "this means that analysts must look beyond the state to examine its incorporation within a broader political system, its relation to other institutional orders and functional systems, and to the lifeworld (or civil society). In turn, the attempt to exercise state power (or, rather, the plural state powers) will reflect some existing balance of forces as this is institutionally mediated through the state apparatus with its structurally inscribed strategic selectivity".

It has been noticed for a while, that in debates about government forms they did not "manage" (management) any more, but adopted different forms of "governance". It was Jessop (2004/2014) who elaborated a reflection on the notion of "governance" not as a specific state phenomenon. For him "in general terms, governance refers to the coordination mechanisms and strategies adopted in the face of complex reciprocal

interdependence between operationally autonomous actors, organizations and functional systems. Governance takes place in all social fields and its scholars have examined a wide range of such mechanisms and strategies, including markets, clans, networks, alliances, partnerships, cartels, associations and states.

Somehow, this appreciation of the concept of governance in the social sciences of today has its origin in a series of facts and appearances that have led to the bad reputation of governments and hierarchies; to the frustration of reformers and revolutionaries; to an Anglo-American political theory of the rise of neoliberalism; the transformation of the so-called Weberian hierarchical model of bureaucracy; the end of the Westphalian order; efforts to reform, update and expand democratic theory through participation and deliberation; the transnationalization of civil policy; the emergence of new transnational risks; the rise of the European Union as a new, surprising and intriguing transnational order” (JESSOP 2004/2014).

Without further discussion and on behalf of the state perspective adopted here, it seems that an approach which explores the relationships between "government" and "governance" from a regulatory standpoint promises a closer approximation to the greater potential for an understanding of processes that are sought to capture as the expression "governance". It suggests that both governance and regulation are the major signifiers of the political structure, the political process itself, and the political outcomes. This approach refers to the bibliography of governance to denote decentralization and diversification of politics and policy and that of regulation to denote the expansion of regulatory governance and the notion of the regulatory state. We could it even call this understanding “neo-Gramscian”, insofar as is not restricted to the internal processes of the State, but takes into account the complex and articulated processes in both political and civil society as well as their interconnections.

It has been shown above that knowing and investigating the institutional (or even constitutional) forms of government within political society are of the utmost importance for understanding the state (even when enlarged) and its performance. Strategic and legal regulations - "institutions" - play an important role in the generation, distribution and consolidation of powers within the state itself.

Therefore, the question of governance at this general level refers to the constitutional debate and changes in constitutional determinations where regulations are being debated concerning relations between political society (State, governments), civil society (non-governmental sector, forms of associations, Groupings etc.) and even with the lifeworld, as Jessop speaks.

In order to conclude this part of an initial conceptualization of elements of a methodology, it is perceived that a "shift" from the neo-liberal concept of governance to a critical, neo-Gramscian understanding also has consequences not only for a review of debates on federalism, federative pact, governmental capacities, etc. which are necessary not to fall unwittingly into a neo-liberal understanding of the term as a form of state emptying. But precisely for those challenges of researching issues related to political agendas, arenas of articulation and negotiation, and institutional formats that need to be designed in their conflicting logics and dynamics.

The hegemonic understanding of both, the academics who participate in this debate and the professionals who are involved in political management and "governing" practices, remains bound and compromised with a neo-liberal ideology. Therefore, critical investigations with a methodology that can only be seen here in the first traits seem absolutely essential to stimulate reflection and provide references about the

Brazilian reality, even at the level of federal issues, federal pacts, federal cooperation, and so on. (See also RANDOLPH 2016b for this).

### **Arenas and scales of power in the formulation of regional development policies: neo-Gramscian governance as solution or resistance?**

The purpose of the present argumentation was not necessarily to arrive at a tentative answer to the question expressed in the very title of this essay about the ability or possibility of regional development policies to reduce spatial inequalities in Brazil. But to reach a reformulation of the question that permits a better understanding what we are asking for.

It is the perspective with Gramscian background that opens a new horizon for the discussion of governance in general and territorial or regional governance, especially. for the discussion of other issues where pertaining to a "present" domination become relevant even when it apparently does not "happen" - that is, through "non-events" - through observations of selectivity and exclusion processes and political strategies of resistance that are a response to this form of domination.

The adoption of a (neo-) Gramscian conception and investigation of those processes of production of non-events (selectivities) will have consequences for the general methodological orientation of studies of governance processes. It will be necessary to relate *specific conjunctures of problems* or crises of governments with the *structural conditioning of institutionalization* of the State.

Ultimately, the problem of "non-events" refers to questions of the exclusion of subaltern classes in the formulation of regional development policies and the overcoming of hegemonies. Its implementation will depend, in particular on the current political conjuncture in Brazil, exactly of strategies of resistances, insurgencies or even of subversion (RANDOLPH 2014b, 2015b) that will strengthen the "presence" of interests of subaltern classes in the forums or arenas of circulation of the power (against the aforementioned "archaic and conservative forces"). Here, again, are that circular processes (virtuous or vicious) which result depends on the conditions of the realization of the process - and vice versa.

Miguel (2014) presents this same discussion regarding the limits that the current institutional framework places for the deepening of democracy. The author's approach, which he elaborated through a "triangulation" between contributions by Offe, Poulantzas and Bourdieu, can contribute, as he says, "to show the limits of the mere incorporation of members of subordinate groups into the decision-making spaces already constituted (the 'politics of presence' advocated by the feminist movement from the 1990s) as the opening of marginal arenas in the structure of the state, which would be more permeable to the demands of the dominated groups (new participatory spaces such as conferences, public policy councils or budgets open to popular demonstration, to cite examples in vogue in Brazilian social science)" (MIGUEL 2014, 158).

Without wanting to deny the importance of these mechanisms, the author tries to understand that these, by themselves, will not allow progress until a certain point. He cites proposals such as the new "social perspectives" that avoids the monopoly of positions of power by members of a single social group; the new participatory arenas - such as the participatory budget - that would solve the impermeability of the political system to demand from subordinate groups; and the public policy councils and conferences where popular groups would listen.

"They are excessive bets, in what they expect from political institutions - and, as another side of the coin, extremely timid in recognizing how the same mechanisms of incorporation of subaltern groups function as instruments of co-optation and channeling of political energies to the detriment of other mobilization forms. They are also shy about reflecting on how politics is influenced by inequalities in other spheres (first, in economic and household relations)." (MIGUEL 2014, page 159)

As the author alerts, although the incorporation into the political sphere of these groups is important and necessary, it does not necessarily result in overcoming power inequality.

"Inequalities mark the presence of these groups and act permanently to guide and limit their action. They have less control over material resources, starting with free time, which is the basis of political action. They are less skilled in the production of adequate discourse because they are often less well trained for debate, often occupying subaltern positions where they do not participate in decision-making. And they have greater difficulty in making their interests recognized as universal interests, because changes in the social order generate benefited and disadvantaged people, while maintaining the status quo can present itself as neutral" (MIGUEL 2014, p.159).

The here presented discussion regarding the selectivity mechanisms (and consequent non-events) give an impression how political structures are capable of neutralizing the possible presence of members of subordinate groups. Knowledge of the strength and resilience of the mechanisms of reproduction of social domination shows the need to resist "immune" mechanisms of co-optation through symbolic rewards and materials for those who accept to play the game of normalized politics (MIGUEL 2014, p. 160). "There is also the permanent effort to 'civilize' the political conflict. The occupation of institutional spaces takes its price in the form of the exigence of adherence to certain guidelines, timelines, and forms of action and discourse. In particular, it blocks the most disruptive expressions of conflict, channeling it to manifestations contained within an institutionality that, as has been seen, is marked by its selectivity. Such normalization of political conflict would have as its main merit the removal of the risk of violence, understood here, of course, as open physical violence, without regard to forms of structural or systemic violence (which, however, creates material effects). It is done, however, at the expense of reducing politics to the routine administration of things, mutilating it from its most creative and transformative potential "(Miguel 2014, 160). There is danger that dominated groups are deprived of their strategies of more offensive political struggles that, in Miguel's words, in many cases prove more effective.

Without intending to make an uncritical apology to the violence of the dominated, it is important to remember that discarding extra-institutional political pressures can paralyze social change. "Even more crucially, the imperatives of political efficacy push the contestatory groups towards the reproduction of the same hierarchical structures and the same exclusionary political logic of the political system against which they rebel" (MIGUEL 2014, 160).

How it is known of concrete experiences, there is the danger that access to the spaces of power implies in changes that lead to the removal of the original ideas. There is a risk that the conquest of political power will become an objective that subordinates the others "instrumentalizing all expressions of the anti-systemic struggle, which would end up validating the cynical and manipulative realism that marked part of the traditional left" (MIGUEL 2014, 161).



This reflection points to possible systematic (systemic) causes that point to certain obstacles or even impediments to the inclusion of subordinate segments of the population in circuits of power. This situation, therefore, undermines the viability of one of the key elements of that neo-Gramscian governance proposal that was discussed earlier. One of the fundamental conditions for being able to refer to a form of governance as "neo-Gramsciana" is the presence of these populations in the processes of political articulation - not just the "participation" of a "civil society".

In today's conjunctural political contexts, it seems almost impossible to find this form of governance at the federal level or even at other federative levels; everything that is observed at the moment points to the (re)emergence and strengthening of its neo-liberal forms. That is, if there were indications of participation and inclusion (not so much of subaltern segments) during the formulation of the PNDR II, today there is no denying the hypothesis that this proposal will not "survive" the political changes at the federal level. If there had already been "pessimism" about the trajectory of regional politics in Brazil, the near future does not promise to be better in this sense. In these circumstances, the hypothesis used in previous studies (RANDOLPH 2014, 2015a), that the formulation of regional policies could be increased when performed on other socio-spatial scales of power circuits, would now gain another meaning. There is no certainty that the here-propagated neo-Gramscian governance perspective sounds to civil society's "inclusion" in policymaking processes will be enough to ensure that the "conservative and retrograde social segments" lose their power to bar development proposals - produce non-events. What is at stake is the question of hegemony whose "distribution" is not homogeneous in the national territory.

For this reason, it would be possible to reinterpret the previous investigations regarding alternative "neo-Gramscian" regional governance at sub-national and supra-local scales where the articulations between development, planning, and power (see RANDOLPH 2016b), perhaps, may offer some potential for regional "inclusiveness" (governance), even within the current conjuncture of the country.

As a certain conclusion of this essay, will be mentioned one of those alternatives that uses intra-federative cooperation (between municipalities) that was created to allow the elaboration of regional agendas by overcoming the fragmented and competing actions of municipal administrations that gained their autonomy with the 1988 Federal Constitution.

It seems possible to imagine that a regional action through Inter-Municipal Consortias could allow greater inclusion of subaltern groups at local level than at other scales such as state and federal. That, perhaps and despite the advance of a neo-liberal project at the national federal level, the local scale could offer some chance of a neo-Gramscian project of articulating regional agenda.

Even though the experiences with this institutional arrangement of consortia are not very encouraging in the creation of "regional managements", in any case, there can be no denying that there is some potential in articulating "bottom-up" agendas (see RANDOLPH, 2014, 2015 a).

It would even be up to investigations whose political perspective would focus on analyzing the potentialities of this format in the regional policies and agenda formulation, with the inclusion of subordinate sectors, as ways of resisting, upsetting or subverting the hegemonic tendencies of a governance that displaces, each public responsibilities and responsibilities for the private sector. It would be a "new" municipalism of anti-hegemonic, Gramscian cut.

For this reason, we have previously looked for alternative "neo-Gramscian" regional governance at sub-national and supra-local levels where the articulations between

development, planning and power (see RANDOLPH 2016b) may perhaps offer alternatives for action (Governance). To reinforce this intention this essay will be finalized with a very brief reference to the figure of intermunicipal consortia as a form of intra-federative cooperation that was imagined as a possibility of overcoming the fragmented and competing performance of municipal administrations that gained their autonomy with the Federal Constitution of 1988.

Nevertheless, to be explored in the future, a more radical form of the “neo-gramscian government” might be seen in the proposal of a “libertarian municipalism” which only will be mentioned here (BOOKCHIN s.a.; SANZ 2001).

## References

- BRANDÃO, C. (2014) Avançamos na PNDR II, mas falta transformá-la em uma estratégia de Estado. *Revista Política e Planejamento Regional (RPPR)*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 1, n. 2, julho/dezembro 2014, p. 339-344
- GRAMSCI, A. *Cadernos do cárcere*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira 1999
- GUIMARÃES NETO, L. Desafios para uma Política Nacional de Desenvolvimento Regional no Brasil. Entrevista especial com Leonardo Guimarães Neto. Entrevistadores: J. Natal e H. Siqueira (realizada em março de 2011), *R. Pol. Públ.*, São Luís, v.16, n.1, jan./jun. 2012, p. 203-207
- JESSOP, B. O Estado. o poder, o socialismo de Poulantzas como um clássico moderno. *Revista de sociologia e política*, v. 17., nº 33, 2009: 131-144, junho (vide também (2006) Poulantzas's State, Power, Socialism as a Modern Classic Disponível em : [http://mercury.soas.ac.uk/hm/pdf/2006\\_confpapers/papers/Jessop.pdf](http://mercury.soas.ac.uk/hm/pdf/2006_confpapers/papers/Jessop.pdf).)
- JESSOP, B. Multi-level governance and multi-level meta-governance. Changes in the EU as Integral Moments in the Transformation and Reorientation of Contemporary Statehood, in I. Bache and M. Flinders, eds, *Multi-Level Governance*, Oxford: OUP, 49-74, 2004. – on-line version is the pre-copiedited, preprint version 2014: <http://bobjessop.org/2014/01/10/multilevel-governance-and-multilevel-metagovernance/>
- LEFEBVRE, H. *A revolução urbana*. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 1999
- LIMONAD, E. Um novo planejamento ou um novo estado para um novo Brasil? In: LIMONAD, E.; CASTRO, R. E. *UM novo planejamento para um novo Brasil?* Rio de Janeiro: LetraCapital, 2014, p. 80-118
- MIGUEL, L. F. Mecanismos de exclusão política e os limites da democracia liberal. Uma conversa com Poulantzas, Offe e Bourdieu. *Novos Estudos CEBRAP*, nº 98, março 2014, p. 145-161
- BOOKCHIM, M. *Seis tesis sobre municipalismo libertario*. Visit 3.5.2017 <http://www.ual.es/Universidad/CGT/pagina/SALA%20DE%20LECTURA/bookchin-seis-tesis-sobre-municipalismo-libertario.pdf>
- OFFE, C. Algumas contradições do Estado social moderno. In: Offe, C. *Trabalho e sociedade. Perspectivas*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro 1981, p. 113-131
- OFFE, C. Dominação de classe e sistema político. In: Offe, C., *Problemas estruturais do Estado capitalista*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1984, p. 140-179
- OFFE, C. Political institutions and social power: conceptual explorations. In: I. Shapiro; S. Skowronek; D. Galvin (Eds). *Rethinking political institutions. The art of the state*. New York, London: New York University Press 2006, p. 9-31
- OFFE, C. Governance: An “Empty Signifier”? *Constellations* 16, 2009, p. 550-562

- POULANTZAS, N. O Estado, o poder, o socialismo. Rio de Janeiro: Graal 1981 (publicado originalmente em francês em 1978).
- RANDOLPH, R. Cooperação federativa, arenas sócio-políticas espaciais e arranjos institucionais. In: R. Randolph; H. Siqueira; A. Oliveira. (Org.). Planejamento, Políticas e Experiências de Desenvolvimento Regional: problemáticas e desafios. 1ed. Rio de Janeiro: LetraCapital, 2014 a, p. 186-199.
- RANDOLPH, R. Subversão e planejamento como “práxis”, uma reflexão sobre uma aparente impossibilidade. In: LIMONAD, E.; CASTRO, R. E. UM novo planejamento para um novo Brasil? Rio de Janeiro: LetraCapital 2014b, p. 40-57
- RANDOLPH, R. Arenas de formulação de políticas regionais: uma proposição metodológica. Revista Brasileira de Desenvolvimento Regional, v. 3, 2015a, p. 5-26.
- RANDOLPH, R. A origem estrutural da subversão em sociedades capitalistas contemporâneas, suas práticas baseadas na vivência cotidiana e um novo paradigma de um contra-planejamento. In: Costa, G. M., Costa, S.M., Monte-Mór, R.L.M (Orgs.) Teorias e práticas urbanas. Condições para a sociedade urbana. Belo Horizonte: C/Arte 2015b, p. 127-103
- RANDOLPH, R. Política e planejamento do desenvolvimento regional e os desafios de governança - Reflexões conceituais para uma metodologia neo-gramsciana. In: 3º Seminário de Desenvolvimento Regional, Estado e Sociedade - A questão regional, uma questão (de) política, Blumenau. 3º Seminário de Desenvolvimento Regional, Estado e Sociedade - A questão regional, uma questão (de) política. FURB: Blumenau, 2016a
- RANDOLPH, R. A tríade de desenvolvimento, planejamento e política (poder): Proposições para investigações de transformações e políticas regionais. In: Virginia Elisabeta Etges; Marco André Cadoná. (Org.). Globalização em tempos de regionalização - Repercussões no território. 1ed.Santa Cruz do Sul: EDUNISC 2016b, p. 39-62.
- RANDOLPH, R. Política, planejamento e governança do desenvolvimento regional - quo vadis? *Redes (Santa Cruz do Sul. Online)*, v. 22, p. 218-239, 2017
- SANZ, C. Municipalismo: una alternativa libertarian. Butlletí dela Fundació d'Estudis Llibertaris i Anarcosindicaliste, num. 5, primavera 2001