3rd EMES-Polanyi International Seminar

EMES events

Welfare societies in transition
Roskilde, 16-17 April 2018

"Caminante, no hay camino, se hace camino al andar" ["Walker, there is no path, the path is made by walking"]: the challenges of self-management in solidarity economy

Adriane Vieira Ferrarini

Roskilde, April 2018

COST
EUROPEAN COOPERATION
IN SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

EMES Conferences selected papers

2018

"*Caminante, no hay camino, se hace camino al andar*" ["Walker, there is no path, the path is made by walking"]: the challenges of self-management in solidarity economy

Adriane Vieira Ferrarini

Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos (UNISINOS)

Introduction

The title carries an emblematic phrase of the poem "Caminante" [Walker], written by the Spaniard Antonio Machado, especially valuable to think emancipatory and innovative processes, like those present in the solidarity economy. Among the universe of social enterprises, solidarity-based economic enterprises have the peculiarity of being carried out by workers, generally excluded from the labour market, through the socialization of the means of production and self-management.

The objective of this text is to discuss the challenges of self-management in the solidarity economy, which is not restricted to democratic governance within the enterprise, but involves a political commitment to the environment and society, in a clear search for the articulation between the economy and the policy advocated by Polanyi. The work is a product of research carried out with leaders of the solidarity economy through the socio-poetic method of self-managed production of knowledge, for which all knowledge is valid and all are co-researchers. The body and emotion are also sources of knowledge, built through artistic and experiential techniques.

With the use of this method, which was not widespread in the social sciences, we proposed to assume self-management - supreme principle and practice of solidarity economy - also in the production of knowledge, enabling workers to become co-researchers. Therefore, the text initially addresses the solidarity economy and contextualizes it in the Brazilian context, emphasizing the aspect of self-management. Subsequently the socio-poetic method will be presented, as well as the process and results of the research undertaken.

1. Solidarity Economy: self-management in the production of life

Solidarity economy cannot be understood outside the socio-historical context in which it emerges and develops, a context characterized in Brazil by resistance to the economic and political model of wealth concentration and by proposing alternative forms of production of material and social life. The 1980s and 1990s were remarkable on increasing unemployment and precarious conditions of life and work of large contingent of the Brazilian population, but also by struggles for the re-democratization of the country. Popular sectors began to organize around collective experiences of generating work and income as a way of subsistence. However, other actors involved in the emancipatory struggles soon realized that there was something bigger and more complex, since a context of material lack for the emergence of solidarity-based economic enterprises was not enough; they emerged where there was an associative culture, mutuality patterns and sharing of a political project of solidarity and sustainable society (Ferrarini, Gaiger and Schiochet, 2018).

Solidarity economy is identified as a counter-hegemonic proposal to the canonical economic mercantile rationality, for which "the only effective economic organization - and therefore legitimate - would be the one that only responds to the motivations of individual interest and that would pass exclusively through the market, purchase, mercantile and monetary sale and exchange "(Caillé in Coraggio, 2009: 16). In its epistemological foundations and ethical principles, solidarity economy is in line with Karl Polanyi's concept of substantive economy as an institutionalized process of interaction between the human being and nature that allows a regular supply of material means to satisfy the needs (IBIDEM: 23) and as part of society, intertwined with social life (Polanyi, 1977; Gaiger, 2016).

Self-management is the way in which the workers of the solidarity economy developed the economic practice in its substantive and socially embedded sense. In the etymological sense, self-management is self-government or management by oneself. If one considers the gradation in the continuum of self-government (Carvalho, 1993), self-management - as a process in which all are managers - contains the complexity of all participatory levels that precede it: consultation, delegation, assembly and leadership of all. Self-management is as old as the labour movement, dating back to the early nineteenth century (Nascimento, 2008), but the term became widespread after the Second World War and the rise of Nazi-fascism that marked the crisis of the labour movement and, therefore, of council communism. The law of self-management presented by Josip Broz Tito to the Popular Assembly of the Republic of Yugoslavia in 1950 was a milestone; it revised the notion of property in socialism, advocating the transfer of factories and other state-owned enterprises to the workers to manage them on their own. The various self-managed theorists formulated a critique of globalized capitalism and Stalinist socialism, theorizing about the possibilities of a future society, whose bases of political participation were more egalitarian (Locks Filho and Veronese, 2012).

> (...) in the eighteenth century the concept of democracy channelled and expressed revolutionary hopes. In the nineteenth century that role was carried out by the concept of socialism. Our thesis is that the concept of self-management is destined to play the same role that democracy and socialism played in its days (Rosanvallon, 1979: 18 apud Locks Filho e Veronese, 2012, our translation).

Therefore, self-management can be understood as a new movement for a radicalization of democracy through the managerial socialization of all spheres of social life, based on analyzes that focus on the economic and political sphere. From the economic point of view, self-management is a form of organization of workers' productive activity. Increasing bureaucratization and the sharp division of labour - influenced by the tools and technological structures of Taylorism rationality - are impediments as decisions become increasingly technical and less political. One criticism of this dimension is that self-management in economic organizations does not mean the increase of citizens' competence and access to participate in the organization of society, as advocated by the political sphere. From a radical perspective, self-management requires the taking of the means of production by the workers and their management without intermediaries (Guillerm and Bourdet, 1976), while the perspective considered reformist (Rosanvalon, 1998) admits the reconstitution of civil society among institutions, capitalist market and state. This last must play its role on social regulation (Locks Filho and Veronese, 2012).

Both views carry a strong utopian character, but it also requires the analysis of conception of utopia. In the light of a modern project of social emancipation, which conceives

reality as totality and proposes a total alternative, it might be an illusion to believe that economic democracy within enterprises would enable citizen self-government, also because it would be useless to deal with management without talking about the seizure of power. However, from a postmodern perspective of opposition (Santos, 2002), in which there is not a single principle of social transformation, social causes, actors and temporality are pluralized, and that power is dispersed, the idea of experimentalism in the economic and political field cannot be ruled out.

> The function of emancipatory practices and thinking is to widen the spectrum of the possible through experimentation and reflection on alternatives that represent more just forms of society. By pointing beyond what exists (...) they question the separation between reality and utopia and formulate alternatives that are sufficiently utopian to imply a challenge to the status quo, and sufficiently real not to be easily discarded because they are not feasible (Wright, 1998 apud Santos, 2002: 25, our translation).

Solidarity economy can be understood as an experimentalism for the development of democracy and politics, as well as a radical and reformist perspective of self-management. The autonomy - a value that is strongly related to emancipation - desired by workers through solidarity economy can be understood at various levels of performance in workers' lives and in society in general, such as: (1) economic: by the possibility of providing life and hold a collective ownership of the means of production; (2) political: through self-management within enterprises and political articulation in forums, movement and networks; (3) social: social and affective between workers and the reconstruction of primary protection networks that reduce situations of vulnerability and even social risk, providing access to services and rights, recovering self-esteem and improving the quality of life. It is common the reference to overcoming domestic violence, improving education and accessing health care with the support of the group, often referred to as "a family." These are evidences of a mode of production based on a substantive economic rationality, in which economy, life and nature merge - since environmental sustainability is also a value and practice inherent in the solidarity economy.

Solidarity economy is a new phenomenon, and in Latin America it also has its roots in the ways of life of the autochthonous communities, reappearing in several countries in the form of a set of socioeconomic practices, such as associative enterprises, productive chains, free trade, collective commercialization and consumption, solidarity credit, exchange fairs with the local currency, etc. The term was coined in the 1990s and it is a wide term used on several continents with different conceptions revolving around the idea of solidarity (Laville and Gaiger in Cattani, Gaiger, Hespanha and Laville, 2009).

The field of solidarity economy in Brazil, sine its origin, made up of a myriad of interdependent social: workers, militants of political and social parties, entrepreneurs, public managers, university professors, sympathizers and consumers. Even among disputes of interests and power, the organic link between the various social actors in the solidarity economy is expressed by the architecture of its political-institutional framework. Deliberative structures, such as the councils and the Brazilian Forum of Solidarity Economy, are parity and had a strong performance in the various decision-making processes. It remained until the impeachment of the president Dilma Rousseff of Worker's Party on 2015, since this party has been historically committed to solidarity economy's cause. New elections in this year will also define the future of public policy of the solidarity economy, since this is a governmental policy and not a state policy.

The feasibility of solidarity economy enterprises and the configuration of what is usually designed as "another economy" have been strongly leveraged through these institutional arrangements, notably through the creation of the National Secretariat for Solidarity Economy (SENAES), but also through municipal and regional public policies. It should be noted that public resources and incentives are still small compared to those directed to market sectors (agro-business, large contractors, etc). Nonetheless, the solidarity economy budget has increased in past years, including financing and actions to support family farming, which has provided significant advances, greater visibility and legitimacy.

There are many challenges faced by the solidarity economy in Brazil. Solidarity economic enterprises need to compete in the capitalist market in quality and price, but workers must undertake and produce in a self-managed and sustainable way, generating social benefits to the community and privileging the maximization of the well-being of its members. Coming generally from popular classes, these workers are characterized by low schooling and lack the usual resources to invest and innovate. Therefore, they need not only acquire technical production and management skills of all stages of the process, but also political competencies. However, traditional worker support policies are usually aimed at individual employees or individual entrepreneurs, failing to meet the self-management needs of associative and solidarity enterprises.

That is why educational actions have been a priority component and also emerged in conjunction with economic initiatives, being fostered by the needs of the workers and, at the same time, stimulating the creation of new enterprises through the work of Support and Training Entities. The training agents in general are militants of political parties and social movements, public administrators and scholars linked to universities. The latter contribute, both through the production and dissemination of knowledge about the field and the creation of incubators for technical assistance.

Training and assistance services entered the Brazilian political agenda through the Solidarity Economy Platform, which was started at the 1st National Solidarity Economy Plenary held in December 2000, during which support entities and the social movement began to demand a public policy of formation. In 2009, the National Secretariat for Solidarity Economy (SENAES), linked to the Ministry of Labour and Employment, implemented the Solidarity Economy Training Centres (CFES) to train trainers, educators and public managers working with solidarity economy, 2012). This policy was developed in the five regions of Brazil through an agreement signed with local organizations. In the South region, its implementation was under the coordination of the University do Vale dos Rio dos Sinos (UNISINOS).

Training in solidarity economy is defined as social construction inherent in self-managed work processes and a fundamental element for the viability of economic initiatives and for the expansion of active citizenship and the democratic process. The training is based on the recognition of the centrality of work for the construction of technical and social knowledge; it guides innovative, self-managed and solidarity-based political-pedagogical actions (Brazil, 2007). The main action of the CFES is the training of trainers and multipliers in solidarity economy through sequential and modular educational activities, classroom-based classes and distance education, for workers, agents and educators who work in programs, projects and actions in support of the solidarity economy.

Training in solidarity economy is conceived under the principles of popular education, which recognizes the practical knowledge of the workers and gives them the opportunity to be

trainers and producers of innovations to be assimilated in the training process. "Education, which is essential for the advancement of the solidarity economy, can only be the one that begins by denying that the roles of educator and student are always performed by the same people" (Gadotti, 2009: 15). The methodology adopted in the CFES also justified this search for coherence between theory and practice:

> We abolished the Power Point. It is not a method for training in solidarity economy. We have always brought something experimental: object, music, something concrete, drawings [...] visits to know other successful experiences. The trainers did not say anything, but the subjects of the other experiences (Interviewed 1).

Another methodology used was the self-management of pedagogy, already foreseen and stimulated by the national body of the CFES, which consists of the subdivision of the group of participants to catch the actions of the event. The self-management and democratic conceptions and procedures of solidarity economy and popular education, allied to the playful and affective environment already established in the courses of the CFES in RS, were compatible with the performance of a socio-poetic research.

In a more discriminated way, the use of the socio-poetic method was justified by the following reasons: (1) to follow the experience of the protagonism of the workers in the training, also allowing them the experience of being researchers; (2) allow continuity and deepening of the use of corporal and artistic techniques; (3) to allow the experimentation of new possibilities of articulation between theory and practice through a methodological innovation; (4) to explore the possible meanings of self-management as a common principle between solidarity economy, popular and socio-poetic education.

Regarding the last item, the principles of self-management are expressed in the economy of solidarity through the participation of members in decisions, regardless of the function they perform, based on respect for diversity. In popular education, on the other hand, self-management appears fundamentally through the contextual and collective construction of knowledge, starting from the rupture with the hierarchy between the individuals and their knowledge in the process. In both, as in socio-poetic, knowledge is not finished or static, but dynamic, dialectical, and produced by the subjects themselves.

2. Socio-poetic: self-management in the knowledge production

Modern science is anchored in the conception that certain knowledge imposes itself on others. Knowledge based on experience and popular tradition is regarded as vulgar, primitive and savage, only transformed into scientific knowledge when collected and interpreted by academic researchers, often occurring an expropriation or apartment of subjects in relation to their knowledge (Santos, 2002 and 2003).

Nowadays, however, educators and researchers seek ways that favour the collective construction of knowledge in an emancipatory direction. Socio-poetic is one such path. It arose from a critique of the adoption of a rigid model that places science as absolute, definitive, and final truth, historically used as a weapon of imperialism.

Socio-poetic was created by the philosopher and pedagogue Jacques Gauthier, based on his experiences particularly with the Kanak union movement, the Kanaky indigenous people or

New Caledonia in the Pacific in their struggles against French colonialism. The method is created and is recreated by its participants in its multiple experiences, and should not be understood as methodology, which is well delimited in science through steps. Although socio-poetic has its defined steps, it is a unique way of collective construction of knowledge, in which data are produced - never collected - and which has as basic assumptions that all knowledge is equal in law and that it is possible to do of the research a poietic event (from the Greek, *poiesis* is creation) (Gauthier, 2010).

Three different elements of socio-poetic research can be highlighted. First, the academic researcher is merely a facilitator who's "role is not to speak to the people about their vision of the world, or to try to impose it" (Freire, 1987: 87), but to adopt a posture of mutual respect and exchange between intellectual and popular knowledge, allowing people to become researchers. From the pedagogy of the oppressed by Paulo Freire was inherited the driving force behind all data creation, which is the researcher group - the first basic principle of socio-poetic - in which all are participants in research, both intellectuals and no academic people are equal members in the rights and duties of the researcher group (Gauthier, 1999).

Therefore, it is understood that socio-poetic radicalizes the participatory nature of the usual methodologies, insofar as the co-investigators participate in all stages, including the construction of the research object and the definition of its product. The latter may be, for example, a play or a work of art. The academic researcher, in general, favours productions that are legitimated in his or her environment, such as articles and reports, which is equally possible, as long as it goes through democratic negotiation processes (Gauthier, 2010; Gauthier and Santos, 1996).

The second differential, a consequence of the previous one, seems to demonstrate more clearly the use of the term "re-reading" by Gauthier. Unlike traditional participatory approaches, socio-poetic does not have a conscious intentionality. The only power we recognize is to open a becoming, thanks to the device of the research. Then, whether the group as a heterogeneous unit, or each person, will make this becoming whatever they want. That is their freedom (Gauthier e Santos, 1996: 16).

Although socio-poetic values the researches with the groups and social classes considered dominated, it does not seek to solve problems or to diagnose the reality of the population (Petit, 2002). Moreover, it is not centred "on the analysis of those contradictions that more clearly show the structural determinants of reality lived and faced as object of study" (Gajardo, 1984: 16). The data are not hierarchical in function of their revealing dimension of the social contradictions.

Besides Freire's re-reading, socio-poetic research is accompanied by other inspirations such as: institutional analysis of René Lourau, Georges Lapassade and Gregorio Baremblitt, philosophy of difference of Gilles Deleuze, schizoanalysis of Felix Guattari and Sueli Rolnik, theatre of the oppressed of Augusto Boal and myth-poetic listening by René Barbier (Gauthier, Fleuri and Grando, 2001). Such inspirations base and favour the production of what is being described here as decolonized and decolonizing knowledge, considering that human beings use different faculties to know reality. We only are human beings by the existence of a body, imagination, reason, and affectivity in permanent interaction (Barbier, 1997).

The third differential of socio-poetic is to consider the body as endowed with these multiple knowledge.

The recognition of the body comes from nurses who move with sick bodies and learn, in their practice, to know with the whole body; from researchers in popular education who find bodies dancing, singing, running, celebrating despite being marked by physical or moral scourges; from several popular components of Brazilian society, mainly of African and indigenous origin (Varela, Thompson e Rosch, 1993 apud Gauthier, 2004: 136, our translation).

The most relevant form of knowing - origin of other more de-contextualized forms - is through practice, solving vital problems that mobilize the entire body, with all its faculties of adaptation and creation (Varela, Thompson and Rosch, 1993). "Hearing, touching, tasting, and sighting are developed in sensitive listening" (Barbier, 1997: 61).

Socio-poetic provokes the knowledge that is in the skin, in the pain of oppression, in the emotions, in the memory of the body, and not only in reason. The inclusion of these sources of knowledge in the production of data could not be done solely through the rational way and the oral expression because they were repressed in the bodies due to diverse oppressions. Researchers imbued with this method intend to think, to know, to research and to learn with the whole body. To do so, artistic forms of data production are used, which bring into play creative capacities and reveal sources that are not aware of knowledge, sources that many subjects were unaware of before the course of the research.

3. Solidarity Economy and Socio-poetic: self-management in the production of life and knowledge

The experience of socio-poetic research was carried out together with the aforementioned training program for trainers of CFES-South, in which workers became recognized as trainers, according to the premises of popular education. Based on the self-managing and experiential principle of socio-poetic, the invitation to conduct the research was launched to one of the participating groups of the CFES. The invitation was that, in addition to trainers, they could also be researchers. To do this, all the steps of the method were followed, which is an important registration, since this requires commitment to advance in a process that involves several meetings (about 6 to 8) and stripping to submit to the techniques, to allow to express memories and emotions, as well to share with the group, welcoming and being welcomed.

The first step was the entrance into the field. The group had the privilege to start with a training made by the "master" Gauthier himself, who managed to build a strong link between the members and the sharing of experiences and knowledge among the group. You will never know what the research would have been without his participation in the beginning. Gauthier prepared and sensitized the group, but there was still no collective decision to do the research.

The research began with the construction of the theme, which should not be induced or deliberated *a priori* by the researcher-facilitator. In order to do so, a resume of the previous moments and processes was made, so that this could subsidize the reflections. By focusing on the training debate, group members have brought that "the supporters do not come to solve the specific problem of the enterprise, but they want to focus on the whole ... we want there ... on our Achilles heel" (Co-researcher 6). A question that is quite present in reality and evidenced by previous research, which is the difference between the references and expectations of the workers and those of the agents of the support and training entities has emerged: "There are

300 supporters giving diagnosis, but no one gives the diagnosis for what he or she [the worker] wants" (Co-researcher 4).

From these reflections came the guiding question of the research: "What do entrepreneurs really want from supporters?" The collective elaboration of the question generated satisfaction in the researcher-facilitator, but also insecurity. Would the question generate a good reflection? Would it lead to relevant issues or be circumscribed to very specific demands? Uncertainty and fear about success are part of all research, but in socio-poetic these feelings appear in a larger dose, because the whole process and risks are shared. The researcher is much more exposed and he is launched, together with the co-researchers, to uncertainty. The only certainty is that the links are fundamental to the collective engagement in achieving a significant result for all and the central focus of the academic researcher becomes, through the technicians, to ensure an environment conducive to this end.

The second stage was the production of the data, for which two meetings were used. Each meeting began with a relaxation coordinated by the researcher-facilitator in order to allow well-being, greater concentration in the activity (since all people came from intense workdays) and the exteriorization of unconscious contents. The co-researchers said that they were very tired, "with a million things in their heads," and after that exercise they felt renewed, calm, and ready to enter the activity. Relaxations were performed in all meetings, even in the later stages of data production.

Initially a notebook was delivered, decorated by the students of scientific initiation, to be used by each one as a "diary of itinerancy ", as recommended by the method, in which one could write anything that came to mind. Itinerancy comes from going wrong, walking without knowing where to go. In the same way, one can write, even without knowing where this will go (Souza, 2008). The diaries were later used in the data analysis.

The first meeting was preparatory to the techniques, but also aggregated relevant data for the research. According to the image theatre of Boal (1988), statues with the bodies of colleagues were made in pairs from free images, having predominated symbols linked to spirituality - especially from Afro religions - and protection of nature. In the second meeting, the sculptures would be collective and would refer to situations of oppression in relation to the research question. For this, according to the method, a corporal exercise was done after the relaxation according to the objective of the day, in this case, to mobilize in the co-researcher the contact with feelings of aggressiveness so that they come in contact with the oppressions.

Subsequently, with the help of an interiorization technique, the co-researchers imagined or remembered a situation of oppression, which was represented by an image, shaping the bodies of colleagues. After the sculpture, each one said what the constructed image represented for him and the feelings that were mobilized in them when occupying the different places and roles, not having correct or wrong interpretations. The work was finished with the explanation of the scene by the author. There was only a case of difficulty in representing, but in the end everyone succeeded.

The co-researchers sometimes embodied the role of the oppressor, sometimes the oppressed, which led to an experience of sensations and feelings, such as: oppression, humiliation, imprisonment, disqualification, rejection, shame, authoritarianism and subjugation, but also pride , courage and unity. The artistic and corporal techniques allowed the deeper contact with the knowledge than only oral and formal report. Throughout the data-

producing meetings, there were moments of joy and pain, in which the co-researchers supported each other, but with a specific responsibility of the researcher-facilitator for the perception and performance in more delicate moments. The role of the academic researcher is fundamental, even in the self-managed production of knowledge, although with a redefined role as a facilitator of the process.

In this article, the need for a succinct report demands the data to be presented already grouped by categories. In socio-poetic, a reconciliatory synthesis is not sought; the end result seeks to maintain the tense difference of voices. To that end, the researcher-facilitator and students analyzed each image, transcribed the speeches and, in the next stage, organized the hypothetical conclusions (so-called because they were not definitive, but opened to be changed by the researcher group) and proposed three major categories of analysis: external or vertical oppression, internal or horizontal oppression, and emancipation.

The **external or vertical oppressions** were considered those made by individuals or groups that are not workers of the solidarity economy, even though they could belong to the solidarity economy movement. The difference is that these subjects have a vertical relationship or are considered by the workers as belonging to a higher hierarchical level, according to the monoculture of knowledge and social classification (Santos, 2006) because they have academic recognition, political office or religious leadership.

Figure 1: Cancellation of the fair	Figure 2 : Psychologist's Group	Figure 3: Religious leader

All the images symbolized lived situations. The first referred to the cancellation of a fair due to bad weather.

> The manager discounted all his negative energy on us ... We had just returned from a CFES meeting and we had a lot of discussion about self-management. When we got back, the manager told us, 'You do not decide anything.' So I had to go back, lower my head and apologize ... even thinking I was right (Co-researcher 6).

The second refers to

> a psychologist, who should be helping but, on the contrary, just put the group down. We had a group of women, including one of them was a prostitute. The psychologist went to accompany and then commented in front of people that group was spoiled. It's bad to hear this from anyone, worse if it comes from a person with a study degree (Co-researcher 4).

The third sculpture represented a religious leader, who disqualified the person in front of the people, subjugated her, but the people welcomed her, and that was the most important thing for her. It seems to be retribution to the oppression experienced, which gives meaning

and compensates the struggle. "I suffered, but it was worth it. The most precious good is to whom I dedicate my effort, and this has been preserved. It is indeed being satisfied and finding meaning and gratification through my practice with those who really desire, want or need: the oppressed, the excluded people" (Co-researcher 3).

The feelings expressed by the group in relation to the images were: "struggle and unity; fear, comparison and hierarchy; be prevented from speaking and acting, feel bound, arrested, without movements; in the corridor of a concentration camp toward the gas chamber; mad to respond, but unable to do anything because he was an authority; a person who hold the rules, preaches them, but does not live them; omission, like crib kitties; deep pain; a silent cry in the chest for many years; disillusionment at having dedicated herself to an institution through her militancy and been abused and humiliated; excommunication; not questioning".

The hypothetical conclusions evidenced the reproduction of authoritarian identities and behaviours by established leaders, even in fields of emancipatory struggle, such as solidarity economy. Managers and entities decide on the use of resources, often without consulting the workers, despite all the appeal for the popular protagonism inherent in the solidarity economy. We noteworthy that this issue is involved by a set of determinants that also meant advances, since the resources for solidarity economy in Brazil started to be instituted by calls for funding, bringing new management challenges. However, such contextualization, anchored also in the speech of managers and supporters, would exceed the thematic limit of this article.

On the other hand, the workers also questioned what they considered to be their omission, realizing that it often comes from fear: "There are many undertakings in which people do not know, at first they are not aware that they are submissive, manipulated" (Co-researcher 6). Or, for lack of resources to impose himself: "How are we going to say no?" And one of the most politically experienced workers ponders: "What do you mean? You have an opinion, you have to express it. Often, I think it's not that they [the managers] are trying to impose, it's an opinion of the person, but the workers feel diminished" (Co-researcher 4).

However, in other situations the omission is conscious, because it would not be interesting to "hit the front". There are partnerships and networks that need to be preserved because the entities design projects and contribute in many ways. Even conscious, omission generates suffering: "We are not superheroes ... we have to maintain a strong position in front of a group, but we are not superheroes. We need to cry, we also have to open our hearts. "The researcher group attributed these oppressions and omissions to the reproduction of established standards (capitalist, competitive and politically conservative) and what they referred to as a fad around of solidarity economy, which is materialized by the existence of resources and this attracts diverse interests.

The **internal or horizontal oppression** occurs between the workers of the solidarity economy, one on the other.

Figure 4 : In the corner of the fair	Figure 5: Shut up and obey

Images 4 and 5 refer, respectively, to events that took place at trade fairs: "At the first fair I attended I was sent to stay in a corner, my things were hidden in a corner just because I was arriving. I was so ill treated that I left that group ... Who is coming now has no rights" (Co-researcher 1). "Our direction of the fair in the square says: 'Shut the hell up! Just obey and do not say anything ... I cannot stand that square anymore ... Well, if you do not go, they will charge you, and if you go, they will snub you... I had to stay in the middle of the crutches, it was the place they appointed me. I sold well, but it was hidden there ... I live on it..." (Co-researcher 5).

The reported feelings by co-researchers in different places were: "Stay quiet"; "Reprimanding look, she is not liking what she is aiming at"; "Do what I want!"; "I felt horrible, bad, authoritarian..."; "I do not perceive feeling"; "I imagine the person who is hidden behind this table to which he is pointing"; "He faced with problems and does not want to know: he does not speak, he does not listen, he does not see", "a person who does not want to get involved"; "You know nothing"; "Not wanting to hear or think"; "Legitimate symbol of oppression... dictatorship...".

The analysis of the two images above concerns authoritarianism and involves more than one sense; "It crosses all the body, blocks everything, stuns, immobilizes" (Co-researcher 3). Other reflections made by the group: "And the person who was in front of the oppressor? Was submission the other side of oppression? Why did he bow your head and leave? Had not he been invited to join a solidarity group? Why did not he allow himself to inquire about it? Would it be bad seen? Speaking things that the other often does not want to know, would be treating badly? Would there be different (constructive) ways of communicating? "

The researcher group understood that it is not enough to belong to the solidarity economy because it is more than an economic practice; it requires a paradigm shift lived in everyday life, in small acts. Solidarity and autonomy are not stimulated in society, quite the contrary, competition and heterogestionary systems predominate. Therefore, workers, true protagonists of economic and also political practice, need to reinvent themselves from references that are not given in reality.

One result of this discovery was that this reinvention happens in the relational scope, which implies the need to prepare or acquire communication skills. After all, communication is extremely necessary in the exercise of self-management, both in the context of the movement and the solidarity economic enterprise, which requires democratic relations and negotiated decision-making.

In both oppressions, the researcher group brought feelings of disappointment and pain. It was as if they had an illusion that solidarity economy could be like an oasis, but it was not. Moments of disbelief also alternated - and they was re-signified throughout the analysis - with those of understanding about the historicity of political processes. Often, the debate about how to position oneself in the face of oppression emerged with a double concern: on the one hand, do not omitted themselves and put the very proposal that everyone believed to lose, but, on the other, also do not reproduce the mere excluding logic of winners and losers.

The research has shown that there must be confrontations, but if solidarity economy can reproduce the competitive and exclusionary logic, it will not be constituted as a counter-hegemonic alternative. Institutional arrangements, proposals and ideologies will not suffice if the values of respect for the human being are not experienced in everyday life, since this is the essence of solidarity economy. And the more solidarity economy grows and becomes institutionalized, the greater the challenges of living solidarity in more complex contexts.

The third category of analysis was **emancipation**, defined by the researcher group as the one characterized by the manifestation in public space, external to the solidarity economy.

Figura 6: Emancipation

The image refers to the fact that many who govern "use the speech of the solidarity economy - which deals with sustainability - but they take ownership of the protagonism and the public space of those who really do the solidarity economy [workers]" (Co-researcher 6). Emancipation reflected the need for workers to take on the historical task of social transformation that is theirs and to have a voice of their own. The importance of supporters - public managers and trainers - and the interdependence or need for unity of the actors involved to get achievements for the solidarity economy are recognized, since all swim against the current in the search for concrete and symbolic resources that are disputed with the dominant political and economic forces in capitalist society. These resources come from public funds, government incentives, marketing spaces, to product with the ability to compete in the market, access to specialized training and advice to the demands of the solidarity economy, etc.

However, the researcher group understood that he needs to maintain its own formulation capacity and not to be subsumed to established spaces. It is a difficult act of "walking on the razor's edge": not breaking partnerships and reproducing exclusionary behaviours, but also not adhering to established rules and behaviours that benefit them in part, but do not meet their desires and expectations as enterprise and social movement.

The emancipation category, under complex levels of "integrating overcoming" (Morin, 1977) in collaborative contexts, was the one that best synthesized a process that

simultaneously is about overcoming conflicts and producing new realities. The aforementioned need for communicational skills has proved to be indispensable, but has not been sufficiently worked on in the formations.

The hypothetical conclusions were returned to the group and generated important processes of reflection and elaboration, in a collective process of data analysis.

> That of being able to dialogue with the other ... I realized this a lot in my speech. I saw one thing, but at the same time I started to listen to others saying something else, I said, 'No, you're right.' So I've built my speech differently. And that is also one... I think... I do not know if we can say, that this is the true construction of knowledge, that it is not a ready thing, the thing is built at the very moment (Co-researcher 4).

Subsequently, the method proposed the stage for the construction of new concepts or categories, interpretation and counter-analysis, which also had the active participation of the researcher group, but less motivated than throughout the experiential processes. This fact generated doubt in the researcher-facilitator and students: was it a reproduction of the academic hierarchy? Was there apathy? Or did the categories adequately express the findings and conclusions of the group?

Finally, the stage of socialization foresaw that the researcher group decided the best way to spread the research, but the group did not take position. The process - which had the emotion and the spontaneity as important components - was the fundamental one for the researcher group. The research was something in and of itself. The co-researchers were not concerned with external-oriented knowledge, but with self-knowledge, and individual and collective empowerment that were achieved by the process, that is, they were coming out with answers to themselves, and this seemed to have been achieved. The mere fact of having a space to dramatize the pains, talk about them and re-signify them with the support of the group, as well as reflect from structural and conjunctural references, generated a welcome and a new understanding that united subjectivity and objectivity, the material and immaterial dimensions of a challenging economic and political practice. The experience meant, above all, a process of well-being, of pleasure in living together and of being involved in a differentiated practice, which seemed more humanized and welcoming than traditional spaces of political struggle, formation and even research in that workers are usually inserted.

Final Thoughts

Both the critique of capitalism and its nefarious social and environmental consequences as well as the statist, authoritarian and bureaucratic models of government have placed by self-managing theorists the defense of democracy as a value (Toledo, 1994). Solidarity economy has shown itself to be a rich field of self-management experimentation and of the substantive and socially embedded economy which, far from being seen as a cold game of demand, supply and prices, produces and is produced amidst political relations of power.

For this, the solidarity economy "hybridizes" public and private resources, placing the logic of distribution and exchange under the domination of reciprocity. In this conception, the solidarity economy has no vocation to abolish the state or the market, but to occupy a prominent place, especially where the market and the State are particularly bankrupt (Laville and Eme, 2004). In the Brazilian case, the context of bankruptcy or insufficiency of the State is

emblematic because there is no shortage of resources, considering the place that the country occupies in the world economic ranking; however, such resources are poorly distributed and inappropriately appropriated by elites. This denotes a problem that is not material, but immaterial, political, or a moral problem.

Solidarity economy, in its manifestations as economic enterprise, social movement and public policy, is not an island. The politically authoritarian, morally degraded and socially unequal context directly impacts the solidarity economy and poses multiple and complex challenges to the exercise of self-management.

Socio-poetic research has made it possible to go deeply into these challenges. Without denying the depth of the knowledge produced, the interactions established and the feelings mobilized and glimpsed by the magnifying glass that the socio-poetic gave, were the most significant elements. For the research group, socio-poetic allowed the temporary suspension of a typical ideal discourse about solidarity economy and of themselves for a living contact with internal and external oppressions. The main insight for the participants was the perception "in the skin" of the loneliness of each one among the groups, the lack of solidarity within the solidarity economy and the difficulty of being ethical in a society where the "Brazilian way" is always given to friends of power and where the poor continue to be second-class citizens.

"*Caminante, no hay camino, se hace camino al andar*" ["Walker, there is no path, the path is made by walking"] was the phrase of the famous poem that best expressed the fact that solidarity economy, despite being an experience consolidated by concrete advances, maintains the character of experimentalism, typical of emancipatory experiences. Reciprocity and democracy are permanent constructions. The need for reinvention reaches all dimensions of social and individual life, in concrete and symbolic dimensions. It also helps to remind that walkers are walking with the reference that the emancipatory path will be relatively predictable and orderly, just like regulatory processes, but emancipation is exactly the creation of the new.

However, if dreams of emancipation move on the terrain of uncertainty, they also navigate a sea of possibilities. The identification of oppressions, but also their welcome and analysis, made it possible to identify Manichaean understandings of blame and self-blame and the search for alternatives. The feeling of helplessness gave way to the re-discovery that the workers were the "real" protagonists of the solidarity economy and they needed to retake this protagonism, to speak with their own voice and to make the confrontations. Even knowing that all are co-responsible for social change and that it is a historical process, the importance of the research was the knowledge the workers produced about themselves and about what they called as their mission. And if "the essential is invisible to the eye" (Saint-Exupéry), the dimension of subjectivity and inter-subjectivity, acting in a molecular way in the constitution of the social weave, has proved essential for them to fulfil this mission.

Referências Bibliográficas

BARBIER R. (1997) *L'approche Transversale, L'écoute Sensible en Sciences Humaines*. Paris: Anthropos.

BOAL, A. (1988) *O Teatro do Oprimido e Outras Poéticas Políticas.* Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.

BRASIL (2007) *Termo de Referência para Implantação do Centro de Formação em Economia Solidária (CFES).* Brasília: SENAES/MTE.

CAILLÉ, A. (2009) Sobre los conceptos de economia em general y de economia solidaria en particular. In: CORAGGIO, J. *Que es lo económico? Materiales para un debate necessario contra el fatalismo.* Buenos Aires: Ciccus.

CARVALHO, N. V. (1993). Autogestão: o nascimento das ONGs. Brasiliense: São Paulo.

CATTANI, A.; GAIGER, L.; HESPANHA, P.; LAVILLE, J. L. (Orgs.) (2009) *Dicionário internacional da outra economia*. Coimbra: Almedina.

FERRARINI, A. (2012) Política pública brasileira de formação de formadores de trabalhadores em ES: fundamentos, avanços e desafios. *Revista Otra Economía*, n. 5(9), p. 185-194.

FERRARINI, A.; GAIGER, L.; SCHIOCHET, V. (2018) O estado da arte e a agenda de pesquisa em economia solidária no Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Sociologia*, no. (6)12, p. 157-180.

FREIRE, P. (1987) *Pedagogia do Oprimido.* Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

GADOTTI, M. (2009) *Economia Solidária como Práxis Pedagógica***.** São Paulo: Instituto Paulo Freire.

GAIGER, L. (2016) *A descoberta dos vínculos sociais: os fundamentos da solidariedade*. Coleção Ecosol. 1a ed. São Leopoldo: Editora Unisinos.

GAJARDO, M. (1984) "Pesquisa participante – propostas e projetos" In: Brandão, C. (org.) *Repensando a Pesquisa Participante*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.

GAUTHIER, J. (1999) *Sociopoética - Encontro entre Arte, Ciência e Democracia na Pesquisa em Ciências Humanas e Sociais, Enfermagem e Educação*. Rio de Janeiro: Anna Nery/UFRJ.

GAUTHIER, J. (2004) "A questão da metáfora, da referência e do sentido em pesquisas qualitativas: o aporte da sociopoética." *Revista Brasileira de Educação* n. 25, p. 127-142. Disponível em http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S1413-24782004000100012&script=sci_arttext Acessado em 10/03/2018.

GAUTHIER, J. (2010) *Sociopoética: O Livro do Iniciante e do Orientador*. Mimeografado.

GAUTHIER, J.; FLEURI, R. e GRANDO, B. (orgs). (2001) *Uma Pesquisa Sociopoética: O Índio, o Negro e o Branco no Imaginário de Pesquisadores na Área de Educação.* Florianópolis: UFSC/NUP/CED.

GAUTHIER, J.; SANTOS, I. (1996) *A Sócio-Poética: Fundamentos Teóricos, Técnicas Diferenciadas de Pesquisa, Vivência.* Rio de Janeiro: Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro: Departamento de Extensão.

GUILLERM, A.; BOURDET, Y. (1976) Autogestão: Mudança Radical. Trad. Hélio Pólvora. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.

LANDER, E. (org.). (2005) *A Colonialidade do Saber: Eurocentrismo nas Ciências Sociais - Perspectivas Latino-Americanas.* Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

LAVILLE, J-L.; EME, B. (2004) L'économie solidaire ou l'économie comme écologie sociale. *Ecologie & politique*, n°28.

LOCKS FILHO, P.; VERONESE, M. (2012) Tramas conceituais: uma análise do conceito de autogestão em Rosanvallon, Bourdet e Guillerm. *Política & Trabalho Revista de Ciências Sociais*, n. 36, p.267-290

MORIN, E. (1977) *O método- 1. A Natureza da Natureza.* Lisboa: Publicações Europa-América.

NASCIMENTO, C. (2008) Autogestão: Economia Solidária e Utopia. *Otra Economía*, 2(3), p. 27-40.

PETIT, S. (2002) "Sociopoética: potencializando a dimensão poética da pesquisa"en: Matos, K. S. L. e Vasconcelos, J. G. *Registros de Pesquisas na Educação*. Fortaleza: LCR.

POLANYI, K. (1977) *The livelihood of man.* New York: Academic Press.

ROSANVALLON, P. La Autogestión. Madrid: Editorial Fundamentos, 1979.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa (org.). *Produzir para viver: os caminhos da produção não capitalista.* Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2002.

_____(org.) (2003) *Conhecimento Prudente para uma Vida Decente: 'Um Discurso sobre as Ciências' Revisitado.* Lisboa: Afrontamento.

SANTOS, B. S. (2006) *A Gramática do Tempo*: *Para uma Nova Cultura Política*. São Paulo: Cortez.

SOUZA, S. S. (2008) "Memória, Cotidianidade e Implicações: Construindo o Diário de Itinerância na Pesquisa" Revista de Sociopoética e Abordagens Afins (eletrônica). Volume 1· Nº1. Disponível em: http://www.entrelugares.ufc.br/antigo/numero1/artigospdf/sandro.pdfAcessado em 15/03/2018.

TOLEDO, C. (1994) A modernidade democrática: adeus à revolução? *Revista Crítica Marxista* n. 1, p. 27-38.

VARELA, F.; THOMPSON, E.; ROSCH, E. (1993) *L'inscription Corporelle de L'esprit: Sciences Cognitives et Expérience Humaine.* Paris: Seuil.

EMES network

building knowledge together