



Public/State Policies: contribution towards the study of the relation state-society

Sidiney Alves Costa* and Luiz Bezerra Neto

Universidade Estadual do Sudoeste da Bahia, Estrada do Bem Querer, km 4, 45083-900, Cx. Postal 95, Vitória da Conquista, Bahia, Brazil.

**Author for correspondence. E-mail: sidineycosta@yahoo.com.br*

ABSTRACT. Studies of public policy have grown in Brazil. However, several authors detect the conceptual blurring of themes and others indicate the prevalence of neutral action perspective of the State and the acceptance of the objectivity of public policy. These factors have hampered the comprehension of public policy as a historical product and expression of the State's organizational processes in capitalism. Current paper analyzes the issue from a political point of view foregrounded on the fact that the close relationship between the neutral and objective treatment of public policies such as 'State in action' strengthens the very social cohesion of the capitalist system. The essay questions whether public policies actually aim at the public interest. After baseline studies involving the theme, current article discusses some contributions and, above all, postulates if it is not the case to rethink the adequacy of the expression 'public policy', as the term 'public', in this definition, definitely concerns the State's role to reach only certain segments of society and it is not addressed to all.

Keywords: State, relationship State-society, public policy/state, education.

Políticas Públicas/estatais: contribuição para o estudo da relação estado-sociedade

RESUMO. Os estudos de políticas públicas têm crescido no Brasil, embora alguns autores apontem a indefinição conceitual da temática e outros ainda assinalem a prevalência da perspectiva de ação neutra do Estado e a aceitação da objetividade das políticas públicas. Fatores como esses têm dificultado a apreensão das políticas públicas enquanto produto histórico e expressão do modo de organização do Estado no capitalismo. Portanto, o artigo adota uma análise política da questão, tendo como pressuposto o fato de que a relação íntima entre o tratamento neutro e objetivo das políticas públicas como 'Estado em ação' fortalece a coesão social própria do sistema capitalista. O artigo questiona se as políticas públicas visam realmente ao interesse público, ou seja, de 'todos'. Após estudos de referência que envolvem a temática, o artigo aponta breve contribuição e, sobretudo, postula se não é o caso de se repensar a positividade da expressão 'políticas públicas', dado que o termo 'público', presente nessa definição, além de controverso, diz respeito à atuação interessada do Estado para atingir parcela definida da sociedade, e não à ação dirigida a todos - tratando-se, portanto, na maioria dos casos, de políticas públicas/estatais.

Palavras-chave: Estado, relação Estado-sociedade, políticas públicas/estatais, educação.

Políticas públicas/estatales: contribución para el estudio de la relación estado-sociedad

RESUMEN. Los estudios de políticas públicas han crecido en Brasil, aunque algunos autores señalen la indefinición conceptual de la temática y otros incluso apuntan la prevalencia de la perspectiva de acción neutra del Estado y la aceptación de la objetividad de las políticas públicas. Factores como estos han dificultado la comprensión de las políticas públicas en cuanto producto histórico y expresión del modo de organización del Estado en el capitalismo. Por lo tanto, el artículo adopta un análisis político de la cuestión, teniendo como presupuesto el hecho de que la relación íntima entre el tratamiento neutro y objetivo de las políticas públicas como 'Estado en acción' fortalece la cohesión social propia del sistema capitalista. El artículo cuestiona si las políticas públicas tratan realmente del interés público, o sea, de 'todos'. Después de estudios de referencia que involucran la temática, el artículo señala breve contribución y, sobretudo, postula si no es el caso de repensarse la positividad de la expresión 'políticas públicas', dado que el término 'público', presente en esta definición, además de controvertido, dice respecto a la actuación interesada del Estado para alcanzar a una parte definida de la sociedad, y no a la acción dirigida a todos - tratándose, así, en la mayoría de los casos, de políticas públicas/estatales.

Palabras clave: Estado, relación Estado-sociedad, políticas públicas/estatales, educación.

Introduction

The studies of public policies address the interactions and complementarities between State and society, highlighting government or governmental bureaucracy's approaches as locus of confrontations (Arretche, 2003; Souza, 2006) as well as the dynamic between institutions and individual motivations (Reis, 2003). Most of the time, the action of State's neutrality is taken as an assumption, along with the impartial interactions between claimants and bureaucrats and mainly, the public policies objectivity.

Contrary to that, this paper seeks a political approach upon the role of State towards public policies, assuming the Marxist's thesis that relations are determined, at last, by the mode of production of material life. Therefore, the ways of social, cultural or political organization are "[...] always a historical product of human existence, [...] an expression of the mode of producing man" (Lombardi, 2010, p. 88). Hence, the scientific knowledge and public policies are also subjected to this determination, because for Marxism, man makes History, not as they wish, but subjected to the conditions that surround them.

The concept of politics

At present, the search for the meaning of the word 'politics' contradictorily conducts to relate to the activity of people's representatives or state bureaucracy, but not to the participation of sovereign nation in power, as in the past. Then, the following questions emerge: What must be understood by politics? What does politics do? Who makes politics?

The classic definition of politics was created by Aristóteles (1985), in the fourth century B.C., in the work named 'Politics'. It is derived from ancient Greek 'politeia', which concerned all the procedures related to the 'polis' or city-state. Words such as 'politiké' (politics in general), 'politiká' (what is public) and 'politikós' (belonging to the citizen) were derived from 'polis'. According to this definition, politics concerns a moral reality of community, whose major meaning is the search for happiness or commonweal.

The Greek society was based on the principle of internal sovereignty of people (direct participation) and on the principle of political isonomy of all the members of the political community, i.e., an egalitarian distribution of power. According to Wolff (2003, p. 34-35), it was possible to ensure "[...] the most possibly complete identity between the two constitutive instances of the politician". The author

claims that:

Politics is defined, therefore, by two essential traits. A community is necessary as well as an instance of power 'within it', and not outside it. There is politics given the moment a community submits to power or since the power exercised by some (some individuals, castes or social class) acts on the framework of a community addressing their way of life (Wolff, 2003, p. 29, author's emphasis).

The Greek society was composed of citizens and slaves; whereas the first were free and dedicated to the administration of the city-state, to the pursuit of beauty and pleasure, the slaves were in charge of performing the heavy work. Hence, commonweal was only a moral conduct which did not search for the good of all, neither the public one, but only the ones who participated in the business management of the city, the 'citizens'. The usual idea of politics as the art or science of organization, administration or State direction derived from this context.

In Modernity, mainly in the capitalist way of production, politics is related to the participation in power of the State or to the group of activities which have the State as a reference (Dias & Matos, 2012). Thus, an answer to the question about what must be understood by politics points the action within the State, but not necessarily in the State apparatus. However, the principle of people's sovereignty and the principle of political equality are not clearly identified, as for the Greek, but

[...] they are complemented and performed in two particular principles that aim at, or at least as an effect, ensuring the exteriority between community and power (Wolff, 2003, p. 35).

In politics, the principle of popular sovereignty is performed through representation, which withdraws the members of community itself from political decisions. Hence, a definition of politics shows it as a

[...] group of formal and informal procedures that express relations of power concerning the peaceful resolution of conflicts regarding public goods (Rua, 1998, p. 232).

Thus, politics in the Modern State regards government action and portrays the use of power, and not the people's sovereignty or their egalitarian participation in power:

Modern democracy applies the principle of popular sovereignty through representatives and does not provide equality for all, otherwise as a right to elect their own representatives. Things happen as if this system made an effort to build, outside the political community from which it should emanate, a separate instance responsible for exercising power over it and

govern it from the outside (Wolff, 2003, p. 40).

Hence, a possible answer for the questions about 'what politics does' shows that politics works for the conciliation of interests to provide a peaceful social interaction and its members' cohesion. The bourgeois politics is, in short, an activity that institutionally searches for concentrating power in order to stop the conflicts and stabilize the society through the action of authority, given the building or maintenance of an order, which is not any order, but the bourgeois one. Therefore,

[...] politics must be understood as a group of procedures that express relations of power. These, in turn, aim at solving the conflicts concerning public goods (Dias & Matos, 2012, p. 3).

Given the above, it is possible to say that politics means possession, maintenance or distribution of power and 'public goods', according to the hierarchical participation in the production of material life. However, it is not about the concept of politics, its appearance, but it is about its real being. It was visible, even in short, that the concept of politics evidences the attempt of the State to remain the arbiter of interests of social classes and parts of it, as well as being the representative of all of them. The parameter for performing this type of politics is the organization of the capitalist State.

Only when the national States emerged historically, in the modern meaning of this concept, as a unitary State equipped with an own power that is independent from any other ones, the modern reflection upon the State, politics and exercise of political power also arouse (Lombardi, 2005, p. 82).

If politics implies the possibility of peaceful solution of conflicts, are the public expenditures policies one of the ways for peacefully maintaining the social order? Then, it is noteworthy to inquire: How is State formed? How are the political exercise and use of power concentrated? How does State act in order to reduce the conflict and ensure cohesion? How can policies be public?

The Concept of State

Another important concept for understanding the raised issue is the State. In capitalism, its apparent political duty is to be the representative of common interest; due to the fact that relating private against public symmetrically has become commonplace. Hence, 'private' is identified as belonging to civil society, common or organized citizen, whereas 'public' is identified as a synonym of common heritage, from which it cannot be object

of appropriation of a few. Searching for the meaning of the words public and private, it is observed that 'public',

[...] as a noun it expresses the nation itself, understood as a group of people with common aims. As an adjective: what belongs to everybody, what if for everybody; what regards the government or the State itself (Lombardi, 2005, p. 77-78).

The term 'private' brings another dimension of social life:

As a verb it originally means the action of being destitute of something or destitute it; as an adjective the destitute itself or, as a result of the previous action, become particular; as a noun: despite the dictionary, from Latin it is known it derives from 'particular' (Lombardi, 2005, p. 77, emphasis added).

However, both words express juridical and social relations and have a historical sense. Hence, as Marxism explains,

[...] the juridical, political and social relations do not explain themselves or through the general evolution of the spirit; the contrary, there are some roots in the material conditions of existence (Lombardi, 2005, p. 72).

Thus, according to Lombardi, the signification of public as a synonym of state and private as a synonym of appropriate is particularly related to the Modern Age, especially

[...] to the advent of the capitalist mode of production, which 'reintroduced' these terms to disguise the exercise of the State power performed by a class, to their own benefit, distorting the social relations, as if the modern State were a commonwealth and administrative exercise, for the good of all (Lombardi, 2005, p. 79, emphasis added).

In fact, the Modern State presents the social reality as if it were over the class's interests, as representative of all, of public interest.

Concurrently with the State consolidation, the Market emerges. If what governs the relations between the State and society are the laws, what governs the relations between the market participants is the contract [...]. Hence, in the sphere where equals relate, a contract only exists with all the participants' agreement, is now the society of equals, the society of market, in the last instance, the private sphere. The association between State and the concept of public starts in this context, because now the public space turns to be thought as the space of political representation, where the interaction between government and society takes place (Cruz, 2009, p. 1).

However, in practice, the State was built and appropriated by the capitalist bourgeois – an

appropriation which is closely related to the transformation of the way of property, because through the

[...] emancipation of private property concerning the community, the State became a particular existence outside the civil society. It became a mode of organization to reciprocally ensure its property and interests (Marx & Engels, 2007, p. 75).

According to Marx and Engels, it was in the manufacturing period that the bourgeois acquired, against the nobility of the absolute monarchy, the establishment of the great industry and the worldwide market. And it also acquired the exclusive political dominance of the modern parliamentary State. In this period,

[...] the modern State, which was progressively bought by the private owners through taxes, gets fully under the dominance of them through the system of public debt, whose existence, as it is expressed in the high and low of the state roles in the stock market, has become totally dependent on the commercial credit that is provided by the private owners, the bourgeois (Marx & Engels, 2007, p. 75).

If in practice, the bourgeoisie 'appropriated' the State and enforced their interests over the other institutions and interests, apparently, the State is the mediator of all the collective institutions and synthesizes in itself, the civil society. It is in the political mode, the political representation, through the law, that it appears as a society mediator. For Lombardi (2005), the bourgeois juridical planning itself will provide significance to the concepts of public and private, giving way to the complexity and centrality that both have in the organization of the regulation of the capitalist society.

Thereafter [the capitalist juridical planning], the category of private, referring to the private law, started to include the group of rules and laws that regard the rights and freedom of individuals as citizens. It also refers to the public law, constituted by the group of rules and laws that govern and discipline the constitution and competency of the State, government and public services (Lombardi, 2005, p. 81).

Thus, the State was constituted as universality, over the particular elements, and the society accepted the law as an expression of common will and, even more, based on the will separated from its real basis [*realen*], on the free will. The bourgeois State changed the 'political being', the sovereign nation, into an 'egoist being', a being excluded of participation in equality of power, in an individualist being:

The 'constitution of the political State' and the dissolution of the bourgeois society in the independent 'individuals' – whose relation is based on law [...] becomes effective 'in a single act'. Man, as a member of the bourgeois society, the apolitical man, necessarily presents himself as a natural man. (Marx, 2010, p. 53, emphasis added).

The bourgeois political revolution objectively overcame the political character of the bourgeois society when it changed the preservation of natural rights, egoist rights – the private possession, into an aim of all the political association. The political life was changed into a simple means, whose aim was the life of civil society (Marx, 2010). However, this revolution abolished the political character of civil society when reducing

The specific vital activity and the specific vital situation [...] to an only individual importance. They did not constitute the universal relation of the individual with the totality of the State. The public issue as such became, beforehand, the universal issue of each individual and the political function became a universal function (Marx, 2010, p. 52).

In societies in which the political State achieved full development, man has, according to Marx,

[...] a double life, not only mentally, in conscience, but also in reality, in concrete life – a celestial life and an earthly life. He started to live a life in 'political community', where he started to be treated as 'community' being, and in 'civil society', where he started to act as a simple private individual, and according to the author, 'the remaining people as means, degrades himself to the condition of means and becomes a tool facing powers which are strange for him' (Marx, 2010, p. 40).

The conflict between men stopped addressing the political State and became a group of particular and egoist pendency to be solved in civil society. The civil society, which appears towards itself and the others as a real individual, appears as an illusory phenomenon.

From the contradiction between the particular interest and the universal one, the social interest, I mean, the State, assumes, on the Marxist perspective, an autonomous form, separated from the real individual and common interests, and at the same time, a form of illusory community, but always on the real base of the existing bonds.

Thus, the state action does not address the public, but the egoist desire. Hence, it is not possible to grant state as something immediately analog to public, as common interest (Sanfelice, 2005). If the state action is addressed to the apparent will of nation, it cannot be seen as analog action of public, neither its policies receive the denomination of

'public policies'. Thus, it is important to question: why are the so-called public policies directly related to the State and not to common or civil life?

From the explanation of this historical totality formed by bourgeoisie, and not the predominance of economic causes, we can understand State as a bourgeoisie representative, as Marxism claims. Then, it is important to observe the way as bourgeoisie makes use of the social force (of power of State = power of community), of ideas (right to word = end of equality of participation) and means of production (right to equally participate in the results of production, distribution and consumption), so that afterwards we can deal with the effects of this appropriation in the public policies.

The concept of Public Policies

The concept of public policies also demanded attention, seeking for its conceptualization, its methodological approach and its axis of analysis. This paper questions the concept of public policies, especially because they happen in the State countryside, but do not reach all, given the fact they regard to action in the state field. Therefore, the following question emerges: are public and state synonyms?

Researcher Celina Souza (2006) performed a study of 'State of Art in public policies' and observed the 'resurgence', in Brazil, of the interest on this theme and identified the inexistence of consensus about the conceptual definition of the field. Thus, Souza presents some usually accepted definitions about public policies, such as follows:

Mead (1995) defines it as field within the study of politics that analyses the government in light of great public issues and Lynn (1980), as a group of government action that will produce specific effects. Peters (1986) [...] it is the sum of the government activities [...] which influence the citizens' life. Dye (1984) [...] what the government chooses to do or not to do [...] Laswell [...] decisions about public policies involve answering the following questions: who receives what, why and what difference it makes (Souza, 2006, p. 24).

Hence, Souza's analysis emphasizes that the researches point the action of the State, highlighting the 'restrictive policies of expenditures'; the new 'views upon the government's role'; the substitution 'of the Keynesians' policies of post-war period' and even the lack of coalitions to

[...] design public policies capable of boosting the economic development and promote the social inclusion of the majority of population (Souza, 2006, p. 20-21).

Thus, the meanings of state action or the State

role is little discussed in researches. It explains why some discussions in which public policies are seen as common elements of neutral and functional politics of the State emerge, in a way the analysis of politics is even reduced to "[...] search for establishment of public policies" (Dias & Matos, 2012, p. 4). Such understanding has made it difficult to provide visibility towards the composition and the exercise of social power, and enabled the focus over the state power. The latter is a *locus* of intermediation of interests and space of politicians and bureaucrats, who started to act as interaction agents between society and State. Then,

[...] public policies is a term that intends to be neutral, therefore, functional to the dominant and legitimating logical of the different programs and actions implemented by the bureaucratic machine (Diógenes & Resende, 2007, p. 4).

Instead of political analysis, in the light of wider questions upon the State role, studies that question, among other factors, how public policies are formulated; who decides upon them; which institutions intervene in the decisive processes; and what problems become part of the public policies agenda, are highlighted. (Gelinski & Seibel, 2008). These studies view the cycles of public policies (formulation, implementation and assessment) turned to themes such as: a) identification of problems, in which the demands for the State are manifested; b) constitution of an agenda; c) formulation of proposals; d) the legitimacy, which many times relates to the transformation of a proposal into law; e) implementation of policies; f) assessment of policies (Batista, 2012).

Instead of going through the elements of the cycles of public policies, as it is common in researches upon this theme, we aim at questioning what makes a policy to be considered as public. Are policies public or state?

Public Policy or State Policy

Dealing with specificities of public policies, the literature regarded them as a synonym of policies implemented by 'State action'; however, they are erroneously seen as those policies that aim at the public interest. But, in fact, they aim at the interests of some sectors of society, and therefore, they address interests which are more focused than universal, more or less organized, which can include their demands on the State agenda. Thus, developing the treatment of the meaning of public and private, it is observed that there are not public policies according to the Latin meaning of it, but state policies.

José Luis Sanfelice observes the same idea when dealing with public and private in the history of education in Brazil. The author claims that:

[...] based on my knowledge, most of the historiography produced in the field established the terminology 'public education' as a synonym of state education. Hence, we refer to public education provided by public school and, rarely, the defense of public school is not another thing otherwise the defense of state school (Sanfelice, 2005, p. 178, emphasis added).

This understanding emphasizes the discussion of this paper, although the author's theme is 'public school – state school'. However, this issue can be perfectly used towards the discussion in the conceptual field of public policies, as both of them, Sanfelice's and the one carried out here, have the State in their materiality and its appropriation by the ruling classes. In fact, it is worth to remember that educational policy is one of the social policies within the so-called public policies. Both the policies aimed at the fulfillment of the particular necessities of the nation and the ones aimed at fulfilling the nation's education are regarded as social policies. In both of them, the main subject of the action is the State, which amasses the legitimate and exclusive right of providing the actions aimed at the public. It is clear that the politics no longer represents struggle within the civil society, i.e., 'group of interactions' to the 'construction of consensus and power struggle' and means 'government action' legitimate to allocate 'resources' of society (Dias & Matos, 2012, p. 3).

The understanding of what public policies are can also be observed through the perspective of approach. The statist or state centric approach regards the monopoly "of state actors [...] due to its juridical character" (Secchi, 2013, p. 2) as the protagonist of public policies. On the other hand, the multi centric or polycentric approach,

[...] regards [protagonists] the private organizations, non-governmental organizations, multilateral organs, public policies systems [...] together with state actors, which are protagonist in the establishment of public policies (Secchi, 2013, p. 3).

Thus, the political analysis of public policies is little representative when we hold on the protagonism of who performs them¹. But we must question why a public policy does not aim at the public, but at the state action, in which the State organizes and produces its legal aspect:

[...] the term 'public' that is associated with policy when referring to decisions and actions performed by a public institution [State], and which will impact on a certain population or on the actors directly involved in its elaboration (Cavalcanti, 2012, p. 31, authors' emphasis).

Therefore, the term 'public' adopts a meaning derived from the action of public power.

Accurately, however, the state school [state policy] is not public school [public policy], except in the meaning through which the adjective 'public' relates to the government of a country or state: the public power. The state school [state policy] is not necessarily public when we assume the adjective 'public' in the way of qualifying what belongs to a nation, to a collectivity, which belongs to all, which is common (Sanfelice, 2005, p. 178, emphasis added).

¹Jean-François Lyotard in *The Postmodern Condition* (1979) uses the concept of 'games of language', by Ludwig Wittgenstein, as a characteristic of the postmodern experience, the fragmentation and multiplication of centers and the complexity of social relations. (Lombardi, 2010)

It is observed that, substituting the terms 'public school' by 'public policy', there is the same rationale presented by Sanfelice in his analysis, then, the text follows the author's steps, when he calls attention to the fact that in its 'noun' form that 'public', in fact refers to "[...] common man, belonging to nation and a determined place with common characteristics or interests" (Sanfelice, 2005, p. 179).

Given that, the noun 'public' which gives meaning to the term public policy shows that it is man's interest – who experience their characteristics and places in common – that should substantiate the concept of public policies, i.e., the sovereign participation of these subjects in power distribution.

In its adjective form, however, the term 'public' appears to withdraw the interest of the sovereign participation of nation in business of the State and, therefore, the State is placed as a privileged element in the mediation of participation, organizing an apparent form of participation in politics and power, a participation regulated in sovereignty and power. In this participation, its protagonists are the representatives elected by the nation, not the nation itself. Thus, it is wiser to denominate such actions of state public policies, instead of only public policies.

Searching for a social perspective of the concept of public policies, it is important to question upon the role of the State on the development of public policies. From the Marxist point of view, the State started to predominantly address the interests of bourgeoisie, and also being able to act, therefore, aiming at the interests which are not common, as in a capitalist society, the interests will never be common. Then,

What is ideologically explained as public education [public policy], in fact, addresses the private interest, and the state education [state policy] must be named

as such, as it is not common or public interest, but private (Sanfelice, 2005, p. 179).

Paraphrasing Sanfelice, we understand that the 'State and the state policy' "[...] are not constituted to preserve the common interests of human beings" (Sanfelice, 2005, p. 179), but to ensure the survival of the ones who do not own private property of the means of production, so that they can sell their workforce for the owners of the means of production in the political order named democracy¹.

If on one hand, the concept of private refers to the market and the individual privacy, on the other hand, the public refers to the civil society, while the State would be identified with the space of political relations. Thus, also in the public policies, the action of state does not appear as an aim of the ones who it, in fact, privileges, but it is identified with the ones to whom the State addresses the action – the public. The public receives an adjective meaning as 'good that belongs to all or interest of all', as it is seen, although this is not the practical result of the state action. Then, once again, attributing the definition of public policies to this specific State action does not make sense. However, it is sensible to identify it as a public/state policy. Thus, the public/state policy regards the political performance in the State countryside, which aims to reach the state objectives that it assumes to itself or as important ones to provide the sectoral demands of society.

Hence, it is observed that the state action – although it is designed and seems to be an action addressed to commonweal – it is more and more focused or sectoral. This understanding is fundamental when it regards public interest, because the State nature, according to Marx, noted beforehand, is correct to claim that the

State or what is state is not public or do not belong to public interest, but it is likely to favor the private interest or interests of the State itself with its relative autonomy (Sanfelice, 2005, p. 183).

The relative autonomy of the State causes what demands more investigation at present, even the relativization of the role of it towards the social demands assistance, whereas the measures of economy force is centered in the State in order to assure the capitalism interests.

According to Marxism, the State as all structure of the capitalist society, "[...] is based on the contradiction between public and private life,

between the general and private interests" (Santório, 2011, p. 5). It is a political tool used by a dominant class, in which the public is merely an abstraction, as well as the expression 'public policies' abstracts its true intention when it is understood only in morphological terms, withdrawing in the study of the totality of relations in society.

Final considerations

The brief discussion raised in this paper is far from being original or conclusive; however, it brings elements that postulate the possibility of regarding the State action as public/state policies. Usually, these policies are only described as public policies, especially when this expression uses the 'public' as a synonym of 'of all', because according to what was shown before, the capitalist State is not the representative of public interest. On the contrary, the State is a political tool used by a dominant class, and for them the 'public' is merely an abstraction, which makes reference to the State itself.

Since its very origin, this State enlarges its control over the economic, social and political life, taking the legitimate and exclusive right over society to itself, upon the idea of common interest. However, it withdraws from the idea of politics as struggle in/of civil society towards the exercise of public interest and becomes an administration of things and resources.

Through this reflection it is concluded that: what has been regarded as public policies were never public, neither can be in a society based upon the capitalist private property of means of production. Thus, it is convenient to name them, more properly, of public/state policies, diluting the little collaborative discussion to know whether it is a 'state centric' or 'multi centric' policy. Similarly, such reflection enables to analyze the considerations of policies, favoring the several involved agents, in a totality view, not exclusively as the 'state in action', something which corroborates with Sanfelice's (2005, p. 185) position: "[...] the role of the State, in its relative autonomy, needs a deep investigation". Otherwise, the public/state policies will not be understood in its multiple determinations, as these brief considerations attempt to show.

References

- Aristóteles. (1985). *Política*. Brasília, DF: Editora Universidade de Brasília.
- Arretche, M. (2003). Dossiê agenda de pesquisas em políticas públicas. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 18(51), p. 7-10.
- Batista, G. C. (2012). Análise de políticas públicas,

² The paraphrased passage is: "Thus, the State and state education are constituted not to preserve the common interests of human beings who do not own the private property of the means of production, but to ensure they survive in certain conditions and so that they can sell their workforce, their only source of wealth, for the owners of means of production, for the owners of capital and, if possible, within a political order which was named democracy" (Sanfelice, 2005, p. 179).

- subjetividade e poder: matrizes e intersecções teóricas. *Psicologia USP*, 23(1), p. 45-67.
- Cavalcanti, P. A. (2012). *Análise de políticas públicas: o estudo do Estado em ação*. Salvador, BA: Eduneb.
- Cruz, M. S. (2009). Público e privado: o surgimento e a evolução dos conceitos. Recuperado em <http://www.batebyte.pr.gov.br/modules/conteudo/conteudo.php?conteudo=1468>.
- Dias, R., & Matos, F. (2012). *Políticas públicas: princípios, propósitos e processos*. São Paulo, SP: Atlas.
- Diógenes, E. M. N., & Resende, F. M. P. (2007, 28 a 30 de agosto). Estado, classes sociais e políticas públicas. *III Jornada Internacional de Políticas Públicas*. São Luís, MA: UFMA.
- Gelinski, C. R. O. G., & Seibel, E. J. (2008, abr.-out.). Formulações de políticas públicas: questões metodológicas relevantes. *Revista de Ciências Humanas*, 42(1/2), 227-240.
- Lombardi, J. C. (2005) O público e o privado como categoria de análise da educação: uma reflexão desde o marxismo. In J. C. LOMBARDI, M. R. M. JACOMELI, & T. M. T. SILVA (Orgs.), *O público e o privado na história da educação brasileira: concepções e práticas educativas* (p. 59-96, coleção Memórias da educação). Campinas, SP: Autores Associados: Histedbr & Unisal.
- Lombardi, J. C. (2010). *Reflexões sobre a educação e ensino na obra de Marx e Engels*. (Tese Livre Docência). Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, SP: FE/Unicamp.
- Marx, K. (2010). *Sobre a questão judaica* (Coleção Marx-Engels). São Paulo, SP: Boitempo.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2007). *A ideologia alemã*. São Paulo, SP: Boitempo.
- Reis, E. P. (2003). Reflexões leigas para a formulação de uma agenda de pesquisa em políticas públicas. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 18(51), p. 21-30.
- Rua, M. G., & Valadão, M. I. (1998). *O Estudo da Política: Temas Selecionados*. Brasília, DF: Paralelo 15.
- Sanfelice, J. L. (2005). A problemática do público e do privado na história da educação no Brasil. In J. C. Lombardi, M. R. M. Jacomeli, & T. M. T. Silva (Orgs.), *O público e o privado na história da educação brasileira: concepções e práticas educativas* (p. 177-185, Coleção memórias da Educação). Campinas, SP: Autores Associados: Histedbr & Unisal.
- Sartório, L. A. V. (2011, julho). A Comuna de Paris e a perspectiva do trabalho. In *Anais do XXVI Simpósio Nacional de História*. São Paulo, SP: ANPUH.
- Secchi, L. (2013). *Políticas públicas: conceitos, esquemas de análises, casos práticos* (2a ed.). São Paulo, SP: Cengage Learning.
- Souza, C. (2006, jul.-dez.). Políticas públicas: uma revisão da literatura. *Sociologias*, 8(16), p. 20-45.
- Wolff, F. (2003). A invenção da política. In A. Novaes (Org.), *A crise do Estado-nação* (p. 23-54). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Civilização Brasileira.

Received on November 19, 2014.

Accepted on January 18, 2016.

License information: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.