



## DEMOCRACY AND LEGITIMACY OF THE POLITICAL POWER IN BRAZILIAN SOCIETY IN CRISIS

José Ribamar Rodrigues Tôres  
PhD in Education from USP  
Master in Education from PUC / SP  
Internship in Teacher Training in the IUFM of  
DOUAI / France  
Stage for Teacher training in Cuba  
Former member of the State Board of Education /  
PI  
Coordinator of the State Education Forum  
Member of Appraisers Bank MEC / INEP

### ABSTRACT

This article was produced from the classes taught by Maria Victória de Mesquita Benevides in the discipline Sociology of Education VIII - State, Democracy and Education in Brazil in the Doctoral Course in Education of the University of São Paulo - USP. It is discomfoting to realize that the theoretical discussions and the reality, clashed by classic and contemporary authors on the subject denounce the intensification of the problems and prove their actuality. It is a discussion about the legitimacy of power in Brazilian society in an ethical-moral, political and economic crisis that is responsible for one of the greatest social and hopeful crises in the country.

Key-words: Democracy. **Legitimacy. Political power. Brazilian society. crisis**

### RESUMÉ

Cet article a été produit à partir de la leçon enseignée par Maria Victoria Benevides Mosquée dans la discipline de la sociologie VIII Education - Etat, la démocratie et l'éducation dans le programme de doctorat Brésil en éducation de l'Université de São Paulo - USP. Il est discomfoting de réaliser que les discussions et la réalité théoriques, se sont battus par des auteurs classiques et contemporains sur les dénoncer sujet des problèmes de recrudescimento et prouver sa pertinence. Ceci est une discussion sur la légitimité du pouvoir dans ma société brésilienne sur la crise éthique et morale, économique et politique responsable de l'un des plus grands social et espérons que la crise du pays.

Mots-clés: démocratie. Légitimité. Pouvoir politique. Société brésilienne. Crise.

### RESUMEN

Este artículo fue producido a partir de las clases impartidas por María Victória de Mezquita Benevides en la disciplina Sociología de la Educación VIII - Estado, Democracia y Educación en Brasil en el Curso de Doctorado en Educación de la Universidad de São Paulo - USP. Es desconcertante percibir que las discusiones teóricas y de la realidad, trabadas por autores clásicos y contemporáneos sobre el

tema denuncian el recrudecimiento de los problemas y comprueban su actualidad. Se trata de una discusión sobre la legitimidad del poder en una sociedad brasileña en crisis ético-moral, política y económica responsable de una de las mayores crisis sociales y de esperanza del país.

Palabras clave: Democracia. Legitimidad. Poder político. Sociedad brasileña. crisis

## SOMMARIO

Questo articolo è stato prodotto dalla lezione insegnata da Maria Victoria Benevides Moschea nella disciplina della sociologia VIII Istruzione - Stato, Democrazia e educazione in Brasile Dottorato in Formazione dell'Università di São Paulo - USP. È 'sconfortante rendersi conto che le discussioni teoriche e realtà, combattute da autori classici e contemporanei sui problemi recrudecimento soggetto denunciare e dimostrare la sua rilevanza. Questa è la discussione della legittimità del potere nella società brasiliana ma sulla crisi etica e morale, economica e politica responsabile di uno dei più grandi sociale e la speranza di crisi del paese.

**Parole chiave: democrazia. Legittimità. Potere politico. Società brasiliana. crisi**

## ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Staat, Demokratie und Bildung in Brasilien Promotion im Fach Erziehungswissenschaft der Universität von São Paulo - - USP Dieser Artikel wurde aus der von Maria Victoria Benevides Moschee in Soziologie Disziplin VIII Bildung gelehrt Lektion hergestellt. Es ist unbehaglich, dass die theoretischen Diskussionen und Realität zu verwirklichen, von klassischen und zeitgenössischen Autoren zu den Themen denounce recrudecimento Problemen bekämpft und ihre Relevanz unter Beweis stellen. Dies ist eine Diskussion über die Legitimität der Macht in ma brasilianischen Gesellschaft aus ethischen und moralischen Krise, wirtschaftliche und politische Verantwortung für eine der größten sozialen und hoffen, dass die Krise des Landes.

**Schlüsselwörter: Demokratie. Legitimität. Politische Macht. Brasilianische Gesellschaft. Krise**

## РЕЗЮМЕ

Данная статья была подготовлена из урока преподавал Мария Мечеть Виктории Benevides в социологии дисциплина VIII образования - государства, демократии и образовании в программе Бразилии докторантуры в области образования в Университете Сан-Паулу - USP. Это неутешительный понимать, что теоретические дискуссии и реальность, воевавших на классических и современных авторов по проблемам recrudecimento субъект разоблачать и доказать свою значимость. Это обсуждение легитимности власти в ма бразильского общества по этическому и моральному кризису, экономический и политический, ответственному за один из самых больших социальных и надеюсь, что кризис в стране.

Ключевые слова: демократия. Законность. Политическая власть. Бразильское общество.  
Кризис

## REZYUME

Dannaya stat'ya byla podgotovlena iz uroka prepodaval Mariya Mechet' Viktorii Benevides v sotsiologii distsiplina VIII obrazovaniya - gosudarstva, demokratii i obrazovanii v programme Brazilii doktorantury v oblasti obrazovaniya v Universitete San-Paulu - USP. Eto neuteshitel'nyy ponimat', chto teoreticheskiye diskussii i real'nost', voyevavshikh na klassicheskikh i sovremennykh avtorov po problemam recrudecimento sub'yekt razoblachat' i dokazat' svoyu znachimost'. Eto obsuzhdeniye legitimnosti vlasti v ma brazil'skogo obshchestva po eticheskomu i moral'nomu krizisu, ekonomicheskoy i politicheskoy, otvetstvennomu za odin iz samykh bol'shikh sotsial'nykh i nadeyus', chto krizis v strane.

Klyuchevyye slova: demokratiya. Zakonnost'. Politicheskaya vlast'. Brazil'skoye obshchestvo.  
krizis

In the first place, we must understand in what democracy we live in Brazil. Its historical roots are the minority interest groups that secularly plunder the nation and seize the majority of all the goods produced by the marginalized majority, suffocated and deceived by each election. What they consider to be change is pure accommodation of forces that group and take turns in power to maintain the privileges and condemn the others who attend the spectacle as simply excluded that legitimize and give force to their executioners, travestidos of "saviors of the motherland".

It is not enough to say that the people elected and with that want to show legitimacy, but it is necessary to reflect that the people elected, but under what conditions? A majority population manipulated by the new populism that in reality is nothing new because it is based on old practices of assistance in opposition to the law proclaimed in the Magna Carta. A population drifting by lack of access to the basic building blocks of citizenship. A population with a majority of non-schooling and not exercising the faculties of analysis, judgment and choice. A majority working population hostage to economic and political power. A majority population excluded from work, health, education, safety, minimum conditions of survival and exercise of freedom of choice and quality of life.

In "The Future of Democracy" Norberto Bobbio (1986, pp. 17-40, 151-171) proposes a minimal definition of democracy as opposed to other forms of autocratic government. For him, democratic rules define who is authorized to make decisions and

with which procedures whose starting point lies in the number of those who have the right to vote and under certain conditions. For Bobbio, a large number of citizens who have the right to participate directly or indirectly in collective decisions are not enough. Rules of legitimacy are not enough as a majority or unanimity criterion. It is necessary that those who decide to be placed before real alternatives and be guaranteed the conditions to choose one or the other to overcome the discourse and practice and between the promised and realized and assert the collective will in order to transform subjects into citizens .

Representative democracy defends the conception that democracy has a collective characteristic where there are groups and not individuals that in the saying of Bobbio goes from centripetal to entrífuga, polycentric, polyarchical by the distribution of power. The author warns that political representation is not confused with representation of interests, the first (political representation) represents the nation and the second, (representation of interests) represents the voters and, as a result, there is the favoring of the persistence of oligarchies. On the other hand, Joseph Schumpeter (2003) considers that democratic government is not the absence of elites, but the presence of many elites that in our view is the democratization for the formation of several elites, that is, the overcoming of inequalities and the access of Decision-making bodies. In this sense it is necessary to speak of a regulated society (society without government) defended by Gramsci (1975), that is to say, society without division of classes which would have the same meaning that Karl Marx gives the evolution of the trilogy capitalism-socialism-communism, the latter being The utopia of the perfect society which in Mikhail Alexandrovich Bakunin's (1995) most anarchist and libertarian view would evolve directly from capitalism without the need for a socialist transition. For Bobbio, without the right to control power there is no guarantee of respect for rights - freedom.

The conception of elite posed in this article is not confused with economic power. Elite, for the author of this reflection, is composed of several fractions of classes: economic elites, religious elites, political elites, student elites, trade union elites, elites of communication, elites of professional categories, artistic elites, among others that form a network Of social conformation and act as a mechanism of control of social groups whose organizations participate or with whose organizations they identify. This process of relations not only defines fields of cooptation but also neutralizes the possible popular liberation movements towards self-determination of the citizens.

There is no way to defend the maximum control of power by the citizens, without also defending the maximum control of citizens by the power. For this, the condition is the educated citizen, a promise not fulfilled in the saying of Bobbio and that means education for citizenship. In this sense, Stuart Mill believes that citizen education has as its point of origin the very exercise of democratic practice, placing electoral participation as a great educational value.

In Brazil, however, breaking the rules of the game into group benefits makes this electoral process disincentive and pernicious to the conscious process of analysis, judgment and choice of its representatives where there is a true "coluio" whose vote is the currency of exchange in Interests of individuals or groups.

Bobbio considers that the transition from a family economy to a market economy and from that to a regulated, planned, protected economy requires technical skills that for Saint Simon would favor the replacement of legislator governments by scientists, increasing the organized bureaucratic apparatus from apex to base When political power in democracy is organized from the base to the apex. In this sense, the author questions that if democracy is a set of rules, procedure how to claim active citizens?

The same author establishes the difference between "government of the laws and government of men", considering not only which and how many are the rulers, but their way of governing. In this sense Plato says: [...] I have here called the servants of the law those who are ordinarily called rulers ... However, the rulers also need the law ... which can not be submitted to Passions Now the law has no passions which is contrary to every human soul "(Politics, 1286 a).

Bobbio argues that the government of men is linked to the figure of the sovereign-father, sovereign-boss who approaches paternalistic or patriarchalist conceptions where the State is considered a family whose ties that unite them to the group are not legal, but ethical that for Kant government Founded on the principle of benevolence, paternalism is the worst despotism.

Reflecting on these ideas of these authors, there are contrasts and advances where the democratic ideology has not been reached, as well as its transformations not carried out in the modern State where the technical apparatus and the issues of citizenship and values stand out.

On the other hand, positions are raised for and against the rule-based government and founded on the will of the sovereign. Political representation and its relations with general and particular interests runs counter to Bobbio's question: "is there any general criterion capable of distinguishing between private interests and group interests?"

We assume that there is neither one in the pure state although we can identify tendencies of representation of interests in the so-called AGREEMENTS. It is not appropriate to say that there is only representation of interests, even though such agreements subject themselves to general rules under certain conditions of economic systems And social. Therefore, it involves broader interests that at the same time satisfies particular group interests. I assume that agreements, while often assuming corporate positions, ensure a series of conditions aimed at ensuring "social stability", linked to the survival of groups in their immediate interests. I believe that the author has touched on the issue of "general criteria". He considers the agreements as a "typical representation of interests", but considers the agreement at the union level to be different.

The unions (today) in Brazil represent different conceptions of the worker's struggle that goes from extreme positions to cooperation and from strength to negotiation, from contestation to the search for results, from corporatism to the dilution of struggles in the general movement. Proof of this is that trade unions have elected a number of militants for parliament, and even so the trade union struggle does not seem to be advancing in their differences.

On the other hand, positions are raised for and against the rule-based government and founded on the will of the sovereign. Political representation and its relations with general and particular interests runs counter to Bobbio's question: "is there any general criterion capable of distinguishing between private interests and group interests?".

We assume that there is neither one in the pure state although we can identify tendencies of representation of interests in the so-called AGREEMENTS. It is not appropriate to say that there is only representation of interests, even though such agreements subject themselves to general rules under certain conditions of economic systems And social. Therefore, it involves broader interests that at the same time satisfies particular group interests. I assume that agreements, while often assuming

corporate positions, ensure a series of conditions aimed at ensuring "social stability", linked to the survival of groups in their immediate interests. I believe that the author has touched on the issue of "general criteria". He considers the agreements as a "typical representation of interests", but considers the agreement at the union level to be different.

The unions (today) in Brazil represent different conceptions of the worker's struggle that goes from extreme positions to cooperation and from strength to negotiation, from contestation to the search for results, from corporatism to the dilution of struggles in the general movement. Proof of this is that trade unions have elected a number of militants for parliament, and even so the trade union struggle does not seem to be advancing in their differences.

Legitimacy is not a legal imposition, but first and foremost a fiduciary process, resulting from a white contract between the citizen and his representatives. This process is based on a set of socioeconomic and ethical-moral conditions that govern legally established social and political relations.

Moreover, among the various conditions imaginable for a legitimacy of the power of representation of the citizen, there is a basic condition for this to take place, which is a society where citizens have minimum conditions of understanding and control of social processes and codes to build A capacity for analysis, judgment and choice that is only possible by the educated citizen. It is not a matter of cultural leveling of citizens, but of unevenness, since a society must be identified less by similarities and more by differences. In this case, differences should not be parameters for classifying citizens as they do in a capitalist society, but differences as a parameter of guaranteeing rights-freedom (civil and political) and rights-credit (social rights) as characteristics of a society Democracy.

The process of distancing citizens from their political representation in Brazil is a process that has been steadily deepening as a consequence of not compromising this representation not only of political-democratic ideals but also of the interests of society that influenced their choice as Popular representative.

Faced with this, power uses the force of law to guarantee an apparent legitimacy that has no popular endorsement. In this case we have an authority sustained by the force of law and not by the self-determination of the citizens.

In fact, the Brazilian history of legitimizing power less by the popular force and more by the conciliatory process of interest groups that are organized and reorganized in function of the maintenance of privileges that are distributed intra-groups and passed on from generation to generation of the same groups , Excluding the majority of the population from the social benefits generated by all to feed only a privileged part.

With this, it is easy to conclude that Brazilian society adopts a democratic and republican legal discourse, but a practice totally based on authoritarian monarchical processes where the privileges are distributed to dominant groups that consider themselves above the law and perpetuate themselves due to apathy Of citizens (subjects) who in turn divide themselves between those who struggle to build a counter-force and those who are diluted in the periphery of power, legitimizing their strength in exchange for crumbs that fall from the privileged.

The Brazilian Society needs a revolution of education, of organization without cooptation, of awareness of collective interests to neutralize the action of interest groups that claim to act in the name of democracy and collective interest obtains the adhesion of fractions of classes to consolidate Privileges. For example, the national congress this week discussed the renegotiation of rural producers' debts, putting the benefit of the rural man on the table, but behind all to benefit the big producers, including the rapporteur of the matter And most of the politicians who have latifundia and say that they are agriculturalists.

A highly unequal society such as the Brazilian one, the untying of the citizen of an ideology of class, of a political ideology and of its representation also totally unrelated to the interests of society can never build a society that values the differences that constitute the basis for a construction Democracy.

#### References

BAKUNIN. *Marxismo e Filosofia da Linguagem*. São Paulo: hucitec, 1995.

BOBBIO, Norberto. *O futuro da democracia (uma defesa das regras do jogo)*. Trad. Marco Aurélio Nogueira. Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra, 1986.

GRAMSCI, A. *Quaderni del carcere*. In: GERRATANA, V. (Org.). Ed. Crítica. 4v. Turim: Einaudi, 1975.

SCHUMPETER, Joseph A. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, 2003.