

CONTRIBUTIONS OF COMMUNICATIVE OF RATIONALITY FOR THE BRAZILIAN PUBLIC GOVERNANCE

Odemir Vieira Baêta (*Corresponding author*)

*Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração - PPGA
Federal University of Lavras – DAE/UFLA
Rua Sargento Dias, 305, Queluz – Conselheiro Lafaiete, MG, Brasil
E-mail: odemirbaeta@posgrad.ufla.br*

José Roberto Pereira

*Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração - PPGA
Federal University of Lavras – DAE/UFLA
Departamento de Administração e Economia
Caixa Postal 3037 – Lavras, MG, Brasil
E-mail: jrpereira@dae.ufla.br*

Carla Beatriz Marques Rocha e Mucci

*Programa de Pós-Graduação em Extensão Rural - PPGER
Federal University of Viçosa – UFV
Rua Nossa Senhora das Graças, 115, Bom Jesus
Viçosa, MG, Brasil
E-mail: carlabeatrizmucci@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

The aim this theoretical article aimed to present and discuss public administration, complexity in relation to the Brazilian reality. Introduce public governance as an opportunity to involve civil society in public affairs, posing as the central argument of the work of the theory of communicative rationality of Habermas and its interface with the public governance. Observed a convergence of positions of studies with the assumptions of the theory of Habermas that local governments in the probability of the development of social control and governance model is greater. It can be inferred that the state and local levels offer better facilities and opportunities for the participation of civil society. The power of management decision must go through a process of change through a power of communicative action, allowing the creation of a better decision space-qualified in the relations between state, society and the market, ensuring discussion issues with the participation of all involved.

Keywords: *Communicative Rationality; Public Governance; Civil Society.*

INTRODUCTION

This theoretical essay aims to present and discuss public administration, complexity and give a brief overview of the Brazilian reality, their pathways and models. Then public governance is presented as a possibility of participation of civil society in public affairs. The discussion presents this, too, the central argument of the work, ie, the theory of communicative rationality of Jürgen Habermas (1981) and its interface with the public governance. Whereas the relations between state, society and the market are not always satisfactory shown that this problem can be minimized so that everyone can explore and achieve better results in the realization and avaliação of government actions. The article is currently based by applying the theory of communicative action, taking into account the collective capacity for reflection and confirm the potential contributions to better understand and institutionalize communicative action within the Brazilian public management. The search for the discussion and consensus of much help to strengthen relations between the various sectors of civil society and governments, so the power will provide and develop a better efficiency in government action.

Brazil lives the best moment in yours history. Recent data suggest that economic development, listed as the world's seventh largest economy. However, know that the social and political development of the country does not have the same advance and have the same performance. According to political scientist Samuel Huntington (1968), economic development should be the result of political and social maturity of a given society, which reached its highest political, social and economic integration level, in that order. To achieve this purpose, this paper aims to present and discuss the concepts of public governance and communicative rationality and their interfaces and from there, to present the possible contributions of this theoretical dialogue. The paper is organized in six sessions:

the introduction is presented a brief discussion of public administration, the complexity of its management, its Brazil's contemporary context, public management, communicative rationality of Habermas and ends with discussions and conclusions.

2 PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

According to Motta (2013), the context of the genesis of public administration occurs in the period of post-industrial revolution, even in the eighteenth century, after the weakening of the aristocracy and the absolutist powers and emerging public bureaucracy in Prussia, since the creation of the first Public Administration courses. Although emerging in Europe, was in the United States that the government gained ground and importance Woodrow Wilson in 1887 adopt the private style in public administration and separate your practices from politics. However, during of the twentieth century public administration and political and professional dichotomy have developed resistance. Only in the 1970s the new government tries to approach political and the managerial approach, where the government will conduct the services instead of running directly, providing for competition, preventing monopolies and promote greater flexible management (OSBORNE; GAEBLER, 1994).

The renowned book *Reinventing Government*, by Osborner and Gabler (1994), although not being considered new paradigm for many scholars in the field of public administration, based on business practices on the basis of modern bureaucracy, these practices still began in the nineteenth century, when Woodrow Wilson wrote his famous article "The study of Administration", the presentation of the panels for discussion between the approach of public administration and orientation of public administration. However, the discussion of the dichotomy between politics and administration is old. Politics has to do with the expression of the will of the State policies; the administration is concerned about the implementation of this will. However, theory and reality are different. A more convincing theoretical understanding and practice of politics and administration comes in classic text of Leonard White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* (1948). While acknowledging that there is a certain implicit separation between politics and administration, White also supported in their definition of public administration, there are interactions between the two spheres. White (1948) opens, in fact, the ability to draw a parallel between the democratic management and democratic politics, with the assumption that overlap in many cases. Public administration is public and therefore dissociates is political is impossible and undesirable democratically. (Bresser-Pereira, 2011). Moreover, political power is always higher than the administrative, being impossible or innocent trying to get around it. Therefore, Motta (2013) argues the professionalization of politics must be before the professionalization of public administration.

However, another question arises at this point is the New Public Service (NPS) as an alternative to the old government and new public management. The NPS is based on the promotion of the dignity and reaffirm the values of democracy, citizenship and public interest as prominent figures in the civil society. This alternative is based on seven principles: to serve the citizens, not consumers; pursue the public interest; give more value to citizenship and public space of entrepreneurship; think strategically, act democratically; recognizes that responsibility is not simple; serve, instead of driving and give value to people.

For Denhardt (2011), one can see three possible perspectives in public administration: the New Public Management and the emerging NPS. Bresser-Pereira (2011) also presents oriented managerial public administration theory, a practice still very present in the reality of management Brazilian public. But even with the common problems of public administration as clientelism and excessive bureaucracy, Motta (2013) shows that a post new governance dilemma is that, directly or indirectly, in the expectation of the community, and requires a space to participate in management. In this new context, the author draws on the work of Williams (2012), which indicates the cooperative form as the basis of administrative efficiency and democracy and maximize cooperation between departments and external entities, considering further, collective suggestions. Always in the same context, Santos and Pinheiro (2011) also have another question: with the approach of the various community and public and inclusion cooperatively throughout the production chain, the role and proactive government tend to reduce. This view is only compatible with the new reality and recommended based less on politics and leadership in providing services of a NPS.

For Abrucio (2007) has strengthened another point, just as important: the suggestion of an efficient and effective public administration must arise from the charge and control of society. This position is supported by Motta (2013) argues that it is a matter of public administration a new partnership role, incentives, regulation and control, to protect not only the production of public goods services, but the public interest. These new conditions not only question the validity of the achievements and latest developments, as well as refine the tradition of seeking ways of managing more relevant and applicable. According to the author, there are so many disappointments and obvious needs of public administration still seems a way unknown, despite recent innovations.

3 COMPLEXITY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

According to Head (2010) states that public management to deal with complex issues and suggests a new thought to effect improvements in the area, through the recent conceptual and empirical research, contextualizing the challenges and difficulties by governments for success in their practices governing long time. As in the private sector, public sector managers pressure results in a diverse environment and constantly changing. In this situation, many countries have adopted management tools based on the market with social actors. Leaders are constantly forced to adopt new practices and reinvent their approaches and their relationships with stakeholders inside and outside the public sector (OSBORNER; GAEBLER, 1994). However, the reality of governance is characterized by complexity, uncertainty, information overload, and the multiplicity of goals for stakeholders, especially the expectations of citizens. The challenge is to carefully identify the true nature of the complexity of public affairs and determine the mechanisms of public governance that are more appropriate. However, the focus of technical and rational intervention has been criticized for solving complex problems in the social and political arena. These criticisms arise, especially complex policy programs setting objectives and goals are not always achieved.

The thought of Head (2010) reinforces the need to consider life experiences and perspectives of citizens and stakeholders in the interventions of the problems for those affected. The modern society is plural and no longer tolerates solutions designed and imposed only by specialists. Social groups have significant differences in attitudes and values that influence the possibilities of more creative and easy to understand and implement solutions. The modern social problems are not always mathematics and verifiable. Instead, they are ill-defined, unstable, that multiple causation and continuous evolution and rely on a trial and a political decision instead of full scientific certainty. Modern public sector managers must face a world in rapid and constant change, in which there are few certainties and many challenges. The classical model of hierarchical bureaucracy must be combined with other forms of management agreements or more dynamic to facilitate effective adaptation policy, in order to meet these new and urgent challenges.

Thus Head (2010) supports the idea of expanding the basis for discussion of stakeholders through dialogue and collaboration. Cooperation, coordination measures and collaboration can be beneficial as knowledge sharing and development of common goals are often crucial ingredients to find viable solutions for the production of durable and effective action. However, this requires a lot of community mobilization, principles and ethics. This approach identifies with education, persuasion and reducing conflicts through dialogue. Durable solutions rely on large changes in attitudes and behaviors. The participation of citizens, and interested in general is essential to ensure a wide range of contributions to the formulation of the problem and its corresponding resolution.

In the most intense forms such participation may strive to mitigate conflicts and consensus building. Agencies, leaders and public managers are increasingly adopting participatory approaches in which the administrative and technical solutions are no longer enough. Collaboration is not the standard output for the resolution of the complexity and uncertainty. However, place to examine the underlying assumptions of how to identify and prioritize the problems.

According to Herzog (2012), the chances of solving complex problems in public management movement through intersubjective experiences of public officials, classifying them as invisible as it believes that knowledge of these experiments is key to practice of good governance. Therefore, critical theory allows improving the intersubjective experience in public administration, the values of equality and respect for the dignity and worth of individuals. These experiences are governed by different dimensions of space and induce actions that are often invisible to the public managers. The careful social construction of intersubjective experience provides managers opportunities to maximize good governance. The intersubjective reality arises from the first interactions between individuals in a given shared and includes several levels of consciousness space, including explicit, tacit and unconscious (Stivers, 2008).

The practices of public administration are shared for rational, thoughtful and value development that guides the actions realities. It is important that public officials using reflexivity about such experiences. Reflection is a form of professional development that administrators use to predict or assess the intersubjective experiences. Such reflexivity can be of vital importance to public management, allowing more critical, responsible and ethical actions (Cunliffe, June 2005).

Thus Motta (2013) brings a relevant question that the attempt to implement an imported model is not always positive, since, in the countries of origin, the logic of bureaucracy is another and not as dense as in Brazil, and the sponsorship of the practice, typical in the country. The focus on public manager showed is simplistic to ignore the political dimension and working conditions in the Brazilian government, as the power struggle leaves his politically vulnerable position every decision. Furthermore, the author argues that governance is always looking

for new and relevant knowledge to solve practical problems. However, it is with this hope that the academic and scientific community, for example, incurs offer new solutions that completely break with the past and they also offer the old practices with new clothes.

4 CONTEXT OF CONTEMPORARY BRAZILIAN GOVERNMENT

Andion (2012) presents the contributions of Keinert (1994), which classifies the current paradigms of Brazilian public administration from 1930 to 1980 and after 1990. The first is influenced by classical administration and a mechanistic view of government action; the second, for an approach to political science and the second offers a new paradigm, the socio-centric development, ie, public interest and the public. However, Andion (2012) recognizes the contributions and deepens the debate on the epistemological level of its central assumption: the functionalist dominance still very present in public administration. Therefore, the author defends the dialogue of different approaches and practices to provide enrichment in this field. Even the government of filing a multidisciplinary field, continues to dominate the rational / instrumental to maximize efficiency and effectiveness orientation. The most influential in the current Brazilian government is state-centered, which is based on the legal and administrative science since the nineteenth century until the decade of 1970-1930, the legal I prevailed; And between 1930 and 1950, the government is gaining ground, but still with a strong rational orientation. Only between 1950 and 1970, the internationalization of public administration in the country and the creation of the Brazilian School of Public Administration in 1952 with the training of teachers and increased publications in the area, are consolidated. During this period, there are two influences in education: a more pragmatic and experimental a more humanistic and critical vision, focusing on maximizing efficiency and leading Guerreiro Ramos (1981) primary name. In a second step, after the Federal Constitution of 1988, there is a restoration of this scenario and new possibilities to reappear in public administration, along with the expansion of social mobilization and control. In 1990, the dialogue with the social sciences allows more critical and research positions. This current, called pluralistic, emphasizes the importance of civil society as a social actor. In this context, Brazil incorporates the movement of the new government, with a very sympathetic to the functioning of the public sphere marketing, a trend that was responsible for government reform in several countries. But what took place, both in Brazil and in other countries (DE PAULA PAES, 2005; Abrucio, 2007), was a comprehensive reform, and not allow the entire social participation that could, in fact, consolidate, according Paes de Paula (2005). The author presents the three dimensions of state and public administration: first, the economic and financial, which involves the issue of taxes; the second, institutional and administrative, involving the state apparatus; and finally, the socio-political context, which involves the relationship between state and society and, consequently, would be the size that would allow optimal conditions for social participation in governance.

Also in this same perspective, Andion (2012) presents the proposed NPS, which opposes current state-centered and the new government. The NPS is a new management model based on democratic and citizenship theories, with emphasis on the construction of public interest more than the sum of individual interests in the community and civil society models that emphasize the importance of local governments, beyond organizational humanism and discourse theory giving importance to dialogue and mediation between the different actors working in the public sphere. According to the author, in Brazil the influence of the ideas of NPS is still very new and occurs especially after the democratic consolidation in the second half of 1990. However, all these factors and possibilities have revealed that in the past two decades Brazil has been consolidating slowly, their commitment to the democratic system, creating a favorable climate for new political and institutional arrangements. In this new dynamic, the author identifies that there is an expansion of studies aimed at understanding the progress and limits of these new institutional arrangements in the public sphere (PAULA PAES, 2005). However, for some authors, the changes are not as significant in relations between the state and society, as Diniz tip (2001), Nogueira (2005) and Abrucio (2007), which only confirms the observation Nunes (1997) that remains a high degree of centralization of power in the Brazilian executive and isolation (bureaucratic insulation) of public officials.

5 PUBLIC GOVERNANCE

The way it is governed and exercised the power is directly related to governance. This concept is not new, was already present in the formation of modern states, but its spread has gained ground in the mid-twentieth century as researchers study object. Public governance is a part of the legitimacy that comes from the process as it is performed, ie when specific groups of the population actively involved in public affairs. Therefore, it is more likely to succeed in their objectives (Bresser-Pereira, 2011).

It should be noted, first, the main difference between governance and governance: the first is the political capacity to govern, the result of the ratio of the legitimacy of the state and its government and society; while the second is the ability of government to take action in the broad sense, to carry out its policies. In the political sense, is to promote accountability and direct participation of civil society in the implementation and social control. The term accountability is the set of mechanisms and procedures that take government managers to provide information on

the outcome of their actions, ensuring greater transparency. The main differences between governance and government is that the first aims to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of government and the second relates to the question of democratic and emancipatory potential.

It is in this context that the government faces a challenge, state size is decreasing, but the job of management is increasing. To trust the public services they need society can no longer rely solely on efficient government and strictly defined terms and traditional. Other actors, mainly companies and NGOs in general, should take the initiative and assume the functions of government to solve problems of common nature, even on essential coordination of a government, a concept coproduction of commonweal (Heidmann, 2009, p.33)

The need for a new result of the state of deep reforms that do not respond only to the needs of its citizens, but allow for a democratic and transparent state (Bresser-Pereira, 2011). The potential for good public governance will, therefore, for administrative and political reform so that public servants can always be accountable and collected by civil society more fair and transparent manner.

It is worth noting the major theoretical differences on governance. Kisseler and Heidmann (2006) argue that understanding the concept of public governance is not very clear, using Max Weber classifies an "amorphous" sociological concept. The truth is that there are several definitions for this new possibility of relationship between the state, market and society. The authors go so far as to question the objective possibility of this successful interaction. However, I believe that local and regional actors have the capacity to develop joint actions, driven by expectations of view and better assess the problems of its environment and its region actors federal level.

In terms of political science, public governance is associated with a change in policy management: a tendency for self-management in the social, economic and political spheres and a new configuration management resulting therefrom. Instead of hierarchy and market models and their power base and capital management, the new model considers negotiation, communication and trust. Given this possibility, governance is an alternative which means that governments can increasingly strengthen cooperation with citizens, organizations and nonprofit entities in carrying out their actions (KISSELER; Heidmann, 2006).

For Frey (2007) notes that governance has to do with the ideology of neoliberal policies that focus on reducing the state, and the inability of public institutions to make the complex and growing urban and social problems adequately addressed. In this context, the author notes that governance is a new trend of public administration, especially the need to mobilize all available knowledge in society for the benefit of improving administrative management and democratic decision-making.

Public governance allows citizens to interact with the ideas, seek alliances or innovative practices to solve problems of society in general. Therefore, governments not only expect contributions through taxes to solve social problems, but seek, in other sectors, real possibilities of managing public affairs are with private enterprises, social organizations and other social organizations. Civil society has an important role. Thus, with the active participation and direct involvement in matters relating to common problems, each of which can offer its contribution, through partnerships or initiatives that promote development and social welfare.

According to Kettl (2002), the government builds new "bridges" and new management possibilities. Public administration must develop the ability to transform a flexible and adapt to new realities. Government has five major themes: challenges, institutional capacity, legitimacy, sovereignty and the public interest. The author suggests how to enforce such construction based on ten principles: hierarchy and authority can not and should be replaced, but should be better conditioned to transform governance; the need for adaptations to the complex inter-organizational networks; Public administrators must have more confidence in interpersonal and inter-agency processes as complementary and sometimes substitutes for authority; performance management can be a valuable tool for solving complex problems and nebulae; information is the most basic component for the transformation of governance; Transparency is the basis of truth and trust in public relations; the government has to invest in human capital, so the servers to achieve the best performance; requires new strategies to establish popular participation in governance; liability must be present in both the government and non-governmental organizations, and the need to develop new strategies for managing the constitutional conflicts.

Today's society is characterized by complexity in the nature of public problems and a new dynamic company, therefore, increasingly makes sense to speak of governance and not just the government. Although the country has developed practical but effective decision making throughout the history of Brazil, Pereira (2011) states that there are other possibilities and opportunities for transdisciplinary dialogue through society, whether between

individuals, organizations and subnational governments. Note that public governance may be one of these possibilities to promote an interface with a sphere of interaction through communicative rationality.

6 COMMUNICATIVE RATIONALITY

According to Habermas (2002) power is formed by the opinion and the will that when it is manifested in public use, allows a way to think more broadly. The issue of citizenship in contemporary society is based on individual potential and the possibility of carrying out their freedom. Therefore, this option allows the exercise of sovereignty and power, sustained by the idea of society as a whole, where the political sphere and people fall into the political decision.

The rescue of the contributions of Rousseau (2002), the construction of the modern state must have its beginning in the social contract in which the individual disposes of the right to the good of the whole community, but nobody in particular. This same association and the general will are interconnected, meaning the will of each must match the will of all subjects of society. Rousseau (2002) believes that popular sovereignty is to form a political body formed by citizens and absent presentation, so that everyone has the right to participate and define. Although Rousseau (2002) has the sovereign power of the congregation consisting of all citizens, Habermas (2002) extends the possibility of sovereignty and presents it as a possibility, in fact, only with the public use of reason all subjects citizens. It is necessary that all decisions and actions, in general, affecting all, are published and covers all topics. Therefore, it is worth noting the rousseaniano thought the social and power relations are very significant for the efficiency and the exercise of citizenship. Today, this idea is complex and contradictory to Santos (1999) also states that there is a regulation and social emancipation crystallized ongoing polarization between individual will and general.

For Habermas (1981) the concept of communicative rationality, which is anchored in the Theory of Communicative Action. According to Tenorio (2007, p.12), "deliberative citizenship is, in general terms, the legitimacy of political decisions must come from processes of discussion, guided by the principles of inclusiveness, pluralism, equal participation, autonomy and the common good ". Habermas (1981) replaces the communicative Practical Reason, and the communicative act an important coordinator of human action. For this German philosopher, communicative action then goes on to describe human behavior. This communicative action should be directed to the understanding, ie, all communication shall be directed to the understanding between speakers of dialogue, communication as the backbone of democratic thought. It is through communication that human relationships are founded. It is this communication addressed to the understanding, describing the construction of a possible procedure of deliberative democracy, so therefore did not establish a single model of governance and mechanisms of popular participation does not remain at the level of discourse and idealization, according to Paes de Paula (2005).

The Brazilian government is still characterized by excessive bureaucracy that often prevents effective in resolving problems and conflicts of social relations. It is precisely in the proposed reconstruction of these relationships one has in Habermas (1981) and his theory of communicative rationality in a real and objective possibility. Habermas concern is to reach and retrieve the junction between theory and practice, a Marxist concern the Frankfurt School. The contribution of Habermas on the question of practical reason - communicative reason - presents an alternative to philosophical paradigm - which formalized the structure of modernity - from an individualistic rationality that focuses on the convergence subject of all morality and knowledge, Individual absorption rational and instrumental actions.

According to Habermas (1981), claims of practical reason and rationalism prevented today's complex social demands were met and in political and judicial protection. This same reason also prevents cooperation and communication between social subjects. The author makes a contrast to introduce the theory of communicative rationality as a proposal to design a society of language, enabling a better understanding of the logic of the best argument as to the former, in fact, promote integration social. This possibility of communicative action generates not only an effective understanding and expectation of a shared consensus on the solution to be achieved by the commitment of the parties to the dialogue, solving the problem and make the desired goal with less formality and bureaucracy and greater interaction communication between citizens and the very public management.

For Habermas (1981) replaces the Kantian practical reason communicative reason, which is expressed in the power of speech comprehension oriented. Therefore, the possibility of a more participatory government, therefore, more deliberative, providing more effective and efficient services developed through the principle of cooperation between the parties. For Habermas (2002), the important thing is that communicative action can establish a reflexive relationship with the world and the possible application in every sentence has its intersubjective

recognition. For this to be effective, the caller necessarily have the cooperation of others, to achieve its objectives in the communicative act.

According to Tenorio (2008) accepts communicative rationality, temporarily, as the solver of the impasse between the two motifs, instrumental and background. He says it is temporary because not accept the possibility of a definitive, absolute paradigm, since knowledge is always evolving. The difference between the two actions triggered by instrumental and communicative rationality is in mediation. The first is characterized by mediation between theory and practice, the second will take place through the mediation of dialogue between actors in social processes. This process will achieve legitimacy if those involved are subordinates and superiors - servers and administrators - dialogically negotiate how the results will be achieved. Therefore, the decision power would be shared and so democratized, since participants defend their reasons based on the best argument. This process is dialogical, intersubjective and allows partners to achieve through reasoned argument, the possible consensus. Tenorio (2008) emphasized that the paradigm of Habermas has not yet reached sufficient maturity to be invulnerable, as the author states that this is not the goal, as the paradigm is continuously subjected to criticism because the process is always dialogic.

7 DISCUSSIONS

Find in Brazil remains a strong fragility of the general also permeated by deficiencies in government deployments and enhanced by conflicts of citizenship, confirming, in large part, the actions and interests of the elite. At first, receptivity by the new government was large even by international development agencies and the public, as any changes to promote efficiency in public services with the tarnished image was always welcome. However, it was found, in fact, has been little change in the results of the quality of public services and the management of public affairs.

There has been a convergence in the head position (2010) with the assumptions of Theory of Communicative Action Habermas (1981), since the author's defense is directed to solving social problems through collective action, then mobilization and debate actions consensual viable manner. We have also seen in the work of authors who deal with the administrative reforms that have occurred since the early 70s, which has its beginning in the federal government, but in municipal and state administrations. Therefore, it can be inferred that the state and local levels offer better facilities and opportunities for the participation of civil society.

In recent decades, in Brazil, several proposals have been formulated and models of public administration, there were several attempts at reforms that took place in time, in some cases. Democracy, now representative, while only symbolic, when the representativeness and effectiveness exists. Think democracy is to view a wide effective relationship between government and society, with individuals within a public space because it allows the effective participation of all. The exercise of democracy is the exercise of instruments for reflection and discussion on the social context. For Habermas (1981), what matters in the democratic rule of law is not only freedom and the ability to bring together citizens, but, in fact, making room for them to exercise the right and the emphasis on communication. However, it is more likely that different actors cooperate on the basis of profit expectations and cooperation by the pressure that comes from the complexity of the problems. As a result, there is a growing understanding that each of the actors just feel powerless in the face of the problem, and only permits collective work successfully, the chances of resolution.

8 CONSIDERATIONS

It was possible to verify the discussions presented by the authors, local governments the opportunity for the development of social control and public governance model is greater. The current model and practice in some local governments in the country is a reality - the existence of municipal management councils, for example - although its constitution still often permeated by political criteria. Solidary local governance, developed after the institutionalization of the Coordination of Municipal Policies and Local Government in 2005 by Brazilian city (Porto Alegre) as successful example of a derivation of public governance successfully performed under the municipal public sphere. The Brazilian government may assume that the power of management decision can go through a process of change through a power of communicative action, which would allow a way for the return communicative power in the administrative power. This outlook for the Brazilian government to allow the creation of a better decision space sized for relations between state, society and the market, in a debate on security issues that affect everyone.

This efficient processing policy can be effective awareness and social commitment based on political ethics, such as self-understanding hermeneutics Habermas communities. This possibility will be the result of a self promoted by social subjects and their implications with the decisions and actions of government that long to see complete consensus. This space is necessary to maintain the conditions of social reflection, when all have their place in the

discourse, respecting differences and reach a consensus on the best power of argument. You can align an environment of political communication that allows the autonomy of citizens and public administration of universes and demands for greater participation of citizens to corporate interests. Through opportunities like this, citizens can participate actively, formally and specifically the way society and government, in the Aristotelian sense to build and expand the notion of citizenship.

The discussions presented in the article aims to present the complexity of public administration, public management and the contributions of the theory of communicative rationality of Habermas and its applicability in the Brazilian public management. It is the exercise of citizenship can be seen enlarged and go beyond the empowerment and recognition of basic and fundamental rights of Brazilian citizens. Current civil society is necessary to penetrate the social problems of Brazil, which are complex conditions through their perceptions and expand opportunities for the protection resolutions with the government. This expansion in the exercise of citizenship may communicative action, establishing reflective interactions with parts that can achieve the validity, reliability and recognition of their statements of argumentation and consensus building. This is the proposal of Habermas and, for this to actually realized, citizens need to verbalize and establish a cooperative dependence on others. This communicative action to the Brazilian civil society able to advance their goals with less formal governance and allow greater participation and communication for effective public administration. In this perspective, the participation of stakeholders in the course of finding good results in public administration should be expanded, establishing citizens and social subjects a new attitude and make the principle of cooperation, which meets a new behavior that ensures the effectiveness and efficiency of public services with more quality. A legal, political and social locus is essential to jointly promote political and social actions. What found in Brazil, still, is the practice of formal democracy, which involves only theoretically freedom and equal participation in political decisions, which does not always provide effective posture and behavior. The popular self seeking efficiency and achieving the needs of a diverse and complex society and presentation of social demands is not always met by the traditional model of the Brazilian government. You can act collectively through public-private partnerships in local actions through associations, non-governmental organizations and churches and other social or private organizations. All have their share of responsibility to the local community and the development of their country. Only the individual commitment will allow the formation of stakeholders in promoting the common good of all, collectively. Whereas public governance has much to contribute to social control and effective popular participation in public affairs, it is up to managers seeking ways to allow the instruments to promote social participation in public affairs. There is also the people to establish means to monitor the fairness, transparency and the provision of the same accounts of public managers. As a suggestion for new questions, and taking into account public administration as a multidisciplinary field research on the possible contributions of the methodological approach of action research as a possibility is suggested to provide enrichment practices in public administration and minimize distance classical theory and praxis.

REFERENCES

- ABRUCIO, L. F. (2007) Trajetória recente da gestão pública brasileira: um balanço crítico e a renovação da agenda de reformas. *Rev. Adm. Pública*, vol. 41, nº esp., p.67-87, Rio de Janeiro.
- ANDION, Carolina. (2012) Por uma Nova Interpretação das Mudanças de Paradigma na Administração Pública. *Cad. EBAPE.BR*, v. 10, nº 1, artigo 1, p. 1-19, Rio de Janeiro, Mar.
- BRESSER-PEREIRA, L.C; SPINK, P. (2011) (Orgs.). *Reforma do Estado e Administração Pública Gerencial*. 7. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. FGV.
- CUNLIFFE, A.L.; JUN, J.S. (2005). The need for reflexivity in public administration. *Administration & Society*, vol. 37, nº. 2, p. 225-42.
- DENHARDT, Robert B. (2011). *Teoria da Administração Pública*. 6. ed. São Paulo: Cengage Learning.
- DINIZ, E. (2001). *Crise, reforma do Estado e governabilidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. FGV.
- FREY, K. (2007). Crise do Estado e estilos de gestão municipal. *Lua Nova*, São Paulo, nº 37, p. 107-251.
- HABERMAS, Jürgen. (1981). *Direito e democracia: entre facticidade e validade*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro.
- _____. (2002). *Teoria de ação comunicativa*. México: Taurus.
- HEAD, Brian. (2010). W. How Can the Public Sector Resolve Complex Issues? Strategies for Steering, Administering and Coping. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, vol. 2, nº 1, Emerald Group Publishing, Melbourne.
- HEIDMANN, F. G.; SALM, J. F. (2009) (Orgs.). *Políticas Públicas e Desenvolvimento: bases epistemológicas e modelos de análise*. Brasília: Ed. UnB.
- HERZOG, Richard. (2012). The Invisible Administrator. *Journal of Management Development*, vol. 31, nº 6, Emerald Group Publishing, Cranfield, UK.
- HUNTIGTON, S. (1968) *Political Order in Changing Societies*. Yale University Press.

- KEINERT, T. M. M. (1994). Os paradigmas da administração pública no Brasil (1900-1992). *Rev. Adm. Pública*, v. 34, n. 3, p.41-48, Rio de Janeiro.
- KETTL, D.F. (2002). *The Transformation of Governance: public administration for twenty-first century*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- KISSELER, Leo; HEIDMANN, Francisco G. (2006). Governança Pública: novo modelo regulatório para as relações entre Estado, mercado e sociedade? *Rev. Adm. Pública*, vol. 40, nº 3, p. 479-99, Rio de Janeiro.
- MOTTA, Paulo Roberto de Mendonça. (2013). O Estado da Arte da Gestão Pública. *RAE*, vol. 53, nº 1, São Paulo, jan/fev.
- NOGUEIRA, M.A. (2005). *Democracia política, governabilidade e representação*. São Paulo: Ed. UNESP.
- OSBORNE, David; GAEBLER, Ted. (1994) *Reinventando o governo: como o espírito empreendedor está transformando o setor público*. 3. ed. Brasília: MH Comunicações.
- PEREIRA, José Roberto et al. (2011). *Gestão Social e Gestão Pública: interfaces e delimitações*. Lavras: Ed. UFLA.
- PAES DE PAULA, A.P. (2005) *Por uma Nova Gestão Pública*. Rio de Janeiro: FGV.
- RAMOS, A. G. (1981) *A Nova Ciência das Organizações*. Rio de Janeiro: FGV.
- ROSSEAU, J. J. (2002). *Do contrato social*. Florianópolis: Ridendo.
- STIVERS, C. (2008) Public administration's myth of Sisyphus. *Administration & Society*, vol. 39, nº 4, p. 1008-12.
- SANTOS, Boaventura de Souza. (1999) Reivindicar a democracia. Entre o pré-contratualismo e o pós-contratualismo. In: OLIVEIRA, Francisco de; PAOLI, Maria Célia. *Os sentidos da democracia*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- SANTOS, M. S. dos; PINHEIRO, I. A. (2011) Governo: um aliado nem sempre lembrado pelas empresas na hora de desenvolver as atividades de P&D. *Rev. Adm. Pública*, v. 45, nº 5, p. 1463-1483, Rio de Janeiro.
- TENÓRIO, F. G. (2007) *Gestão Social: metodologia, casos e práticas*. Rio de Janeiro: FGV.
- _____. (2008) *Tem Razão a administração?* 3. São Paulo: Ijuí.
- WHITE, L. D. (1948) *The federalist*. New York: Macmillan.
- WILLIAMS, P. (2012) *Collaboration in public policy and practice*. Bristol: The Policy.