

DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION IN THE MANAGEMENT OF COMMON NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE NATIVE POPULATIONS IN THE SOUTHERN COAST OF PARANÁ¹

LARISSA MELLINGER²
DIMAS FLORIANI³

Participatory and Deliberative Democracy

The current debate on democracy seems to be based on five models which, according to Coelho e Nobre (2004), have become reference points, namely: the “elitist”, the “pluralist”, the “legal”, the “participatory” and the “deliberative” models. In this paper we will focus on the last two.

The “participatory” model became known as the “new left” model in contrast to the “legal” model. Carole Pateman, Nikos Poulantzas and C.B. Macpherson conceived this model in order to overcome material inequalities and deficits in political opinion-making, as well as to increase citizen participation in decision-making processes. It is important to stress that their theories did not seek to substitute representation mechanisms, but to establish spaces for direct participation alongside political representation (COELHO; NOBRE, 2004). According to Pateman (1992), the participatory democracy theorist par excellence was Rousseau, followed by John Stuart Mill and, more recently, G.D.H. Cole. Rousseau’s political theory is based on the individual participation of each citizen in the political decision-making process. This has a psychological effect on those who take part, ensuring an ongoing relationship between the way institutions work and the characteristics and psychological attitudes of the individuals engaged therein. Rousseau argued that certain economic conditions had to be met in order for the participatory system to operate, given that existing differences should not lead to political inequality. That is, no citizen should be rich enough to buy another and none should be so poor as to need to sell themselves. In his view, therefore, it was essential that every man owned a certain amount of property. He believed that, ideally, only individuals and not organized groups

1. Translated by PJ Language Services

2. Biologist, Masters in ecology by INPA in Manaus and Ph.D. in sociology by the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR). IFPR. larissa.mellinger@ifpr.edu.br

3. Sociologist, post-doctorate (Colegio de Mexico), Senior Lecturer on the PPGMADE-UFPR. dimas@casla.com.br

should take part in decision-making, given that the latter might want their “private wishes” to prevail. Rousseau argued that if it is impossible to prevent organized associations from forming within communities, they should be as equal as possible in terms of their number and political power. He argued that participation could increase the value of freedom for individuals, enabling them to be (or remain) their own masters.

In addition to the importance of participation as an educational instrument, as put forward by Rousseau, Mill brings a new dimension to the theory, arguing that participation in the work place is political participation par excellence. Just as participating in the administration of the public interest within local politics teaches individuals to become socially responsible, participating in the administration of the collective interest within industrial organizations stimulates and develops the attributes individuals need in order to conduct public activities. In this format, employer/employee relations cannot be sustained in the long-term and must be substituted by some form of co-operation which includes administrators (government) elected by the whole workforce, in the same way that representatives are elected at the local level. For Cole, industry is the key to a form of government that is truly democratic, given that it is in the workplace that individuals are more involved in superior and subordinate relationships. Men need to work together in associations in order to satisfy their needs. Thus, what brings men together into associations and the ways in which men act through these organizations, supplementing and complementing their actions as single or private individuals, becomes a subject for analysis. Cole developed a theory of association in which he defined society as a set of associations held together by the wishes of their members. If individuals want to be self-governing, then they not only need to be able to take part in decision-making in all the associations of which they are members, but these associations need be free and must be self-governing in political terms.

In short, the participatory theory of democracy argues that individuals and their institutions cannot be considered in isolation. Furthermore, representative institutions at the national level are not a sufficient condition for democracy. It is only by participating at the local level, at work and in local associations that individuals can “learn democracy”. In addition, participatory democracy becomes self-sustainable because of the educational (its main function) impact of the participatory process. Other benefits are integration and enabling individuals to accept collective decisions (PATEMAN, 1992).

The “deliberative” model, defended by Bernard Manin, Jürgen Habermas and Joshua Cohen involves a theory of democracy which is explicitly normative, where one of the prerequisites is the legitimacy of democratic processes which depends on the impartiality of deliberative procedures. Rules and regulations are considered valid when they are accepted by all those who are affected by their consequences. Habermas (1990, in AVRITZER; COSTA, 2004) introduced new elements into democratic theory when he developed his discursive model of the public sphere. He argued that the public space is indispensable for forming democratic opinions, for the collective will, and for mediation between, on the one hand, civil society, and on the other, the State and the political system. He enhanced the debate between the elitist and participatory models, opening the way for a new relationship between rationality and participation. According to Habermas,

the source of political legitimacy cannot be the will of individual citizens but the result of a communicative process which forms collective opinions and the collective will. It is, therefore, essential that citizens provide rational arguments to their peers so as to justify their decisions. This process takes place in the public sphere and establishes a link between the lifeworld¹ and the political system, so that impulses coming from the lifeworld reach the decision-making forums instituted by the democratic order.

Habermas' main contribution was rescuing the public space, where individuals can interact and position themselves in a critical manner towards the State, thus ending the polarization of debates between the elitist and participatory theories of democracy, giving more importance to developing the argumentation of preferences instead of simply aggregating interests (PEREIRA, 2007).

Habermas' model of the public sphere does not necessarily constitute a concrete and institutionalized space, rather it is a communicative flow network which comes together as public opinion (1997, p.92). Although his model has been fundamental for deliberative theories, it received considerable criticism and was complemented in a number of ways, with the recognition of the importance of "new publics" (COHEN; ARATO, 1992), "counterpublics" (FRASER, 1992, 2002), "diasporic publics" (GILROY, 1993) and "deliberative publics" (AVRITZER; COHEN, 2004), as well as other proposals by Young (2002) and Dryzek (2000).

According to Fraser, the idea of a single all-encompassing national public sphere does not take into account asymmetric power relations which have historically impacted on the contemporary processes for constructing public spheres. Public sphere mechanisms are selective and require a prior definition of the actors who will effectively be heard and the topics which will be publicly addressed. In this context, ethnic minorities, discriminated groups and women (the so-called "counterpublics") are excluded *a priori* or remain in a subordinate position within the public sphere. Gilroy refers to the black Atlantic, a cultural space set within the framework of the African diaspora which began with modern slavery. Black slaves, and later their descendants, considered dance and music as part of their constitution, performance and organization. They were also excluded from the process of constructing a type of politics which was governed by the rule of the white man, the word and the separation between performance and rationality.

Habermas' concern in defending the institutional character of the rule of law, where civil society can have a political influence but neither decides nor implements policies, leads him to wholly underestimate public participation structures. Throughout his discussion on public space, there is no mention of the need to horizontalize decision-making processes, connecting discussion processes and public deliberation, and conferring effective power onto the different social actors so they can become real "deliberative publics" (AVRITZER; COSTA, 2004).

Two alternative proposals are put forward so as not to restrict the participation of individuals in public discourse. Young (2002) argues for communicative democracy, based on other forms of communication which go beyond rational argumentation, for example, greeting, understood as a communicative form which precedes the exchange of reason during a discussion; rhetoric, understood as the exchange of arguments but specifically

directed at an audience, with a particular style and tone, and finally; narrative or testimony, understood as a mechanism for sharing life experiences.

Dryzek (2000) expands the notion of communicative democracy to include discursive democracy, drawing attention to the fact that rhetoric can coerce audiences by manipulating their emotions. The communication forms employed in discursive democracy must not promote coercion. On the other hand, they must be able to connect an individual, group or category's particular experience to some more general principle. Therefore, he claims "taking difference seriously means attending to different identities and to the different kinds of communication that accompany them, refusing to erase them in the name of a unitary public reason" (DRYZEK, 2004, p.51).

In this way it could be said that the participatory models, and in particular the deliberative model together with its critiques and complements, could be effective ways of guaranteeing the real participation of society in decision-making processes. Moreover, they could be considered non-hegemonic forms of democracy in contrast to the hegemonic models of elitist and liberal representative democracies. However, do these models really break with the exclusion and lack of social participation in State decision-making, or are they mere re-arrangements of the status quo?

Some of the subjects who participate (or not) in public spaces, such as native populations, artisanal fishermen, traditional extractive populations and peasants, work within a preceding dynamics: that of the family unit which influences the way these subjects act in other spheres, for example, their "community" and region (associations, management councils). According to the literature on peasant farmers (GARCIA JÚNIOR, 1990, HEREDIA, 1979; MOURA, 1978; WOORTMANN, 1990, 2009), certain specific characteristics and social relations of family units/households must be taken into account in order to understand these groups in different spheres, regardless of what these groups call themselves or of how they are recognized by external agents.

The Nature Conservation Units management councils (UC)ⁱⁱ are considered by public administration bodies, non-governmental organizations and other social actors as the highest decision-making forums for participatory management within the regional environmental arena - the highest in terms of the public management of common natural resourcesⁱⁱⁱ. It seems that participatory management through the UC management councils emerges as an alternative to the hegemonic paradigm of "command and control" (a way of centralizing the State's power based on regulation and monitoring) of public environmental management. It is also an alternative to the elitist or liberal representative model of democracy. The question asked here is what model of democratic management (governance) is used in the UC management councils in Brazil?

Are the existing democratic administration models adequate to encompass all the complexities and different modes of integration between society and nature with regard to the management of common natural resources? Is social participation - much proclaimed by public administration managers of protected natural sites - sufficient to guarantee cultural plurality and diversity of experiences and spheres, involving the management of common goods?

Family Units and their Decision-Making Processes

This research involved conducting an important field study with family units around the Guaratuba Bay in a number of situations relating to their social, economic, cultural and political set ups.

It could be said that the family units in this study correspond to primary spaces of sociabilities and social reproduction of the “native”^{iv} which generally include the home, their shift cultivation and home plots^v. “Native” is a social category based on a conception which brings together earth, water, mangrove, family and work, where one does not exist without the other and where these factors are linked to values and core organizational dynamics such as honour, hierarchy and the cycles of nature. Usually these units are part of wider social contexts - networks involving elements such as family, neighbourhood, religion, production and the management of common natural resources which are not thought of as “isolated units”.

Native residents of Guaratuba Bay are described by other authors as a *caçara* population (DIEGUES, 1988; SONDA, 2002; BALZON, 2000; FERREIRA, 2009), understood as coastal populations associated to the land through subsistence, fishing and extractive activities, as well as in terms of their kinship and mutual assistance relations (DIEGUES, 1983). According to Adams (2000), the term *caçara* comes from the Tupi-Guarani “*caá-içara*” (SAMPAIO, 1987), used to describe the poles or stakes placed around indigenous settlements and the enclosures made of tree branches staked in the water to capture fish. In time, this became the name given to the huts built on beaches to shelter canoes and other fishing equipment, subsequently becoming the name given to the residents of Cananéia (Fundação SOS Mata Atlântica, 1992). Later, this term was used to designate all individuals and communities in the coast of the states of Paraná, São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro (DIEGUES, 1988).

Nevertheless, the local population around Guaratuba Bay does not call or identify itself as *caçara*, but as “natives”. Therefore, the author decided to use the term “native” throughout this text, given that this is how the subjects of this research generally refer to themselves.

Land conflicts involving logging companies, people “from outside” and even the State (associated to environmental regulation issues) have meant that natives have become adapted to new scenarios which were gradually imposed into their environment, resulting in the re-arrangement and re-signification of their main subsistence and economic activities. They continue to be a traditional “*caçara*” population, given that, currently, being thus classified has meant the acquisition and development of their rights. In other words, the term has been employed as a political tool, but over time changes to this population and in modernity have gradually transformed it into a hybrid and complex category.

The Family Unit dynamics is based on the diversity of productive activities, involving both material and immaterial practices, thus ensuring social reproduction, and is the impetus behind every day decision-making. Decisions about the use of common natural resources in the Guaratuba Bay region, and which take place within the family unit (FU) and the local area (the FU territory), involve “rational choice” (decisions which are only relevant to the family and its social and economic reproduction) and also choices which

take into account the common use of resources based on traditional arrangements and rules, directly influenced by modern environmental legislation. This family unit territory does not constitute a harmonious, self-organized and conflict-less community. It is a social territory involving intra and inter-family relationships, as well as comradeship and neighbourhood relations which result in agreements and disagreements.

Management councils, the public spaces for inclusion and social participation, contemplate the inclusion of collective objectives by following the formal rules of representation. It is implicit that given this is a very restricted collective space, collective organization and representation are inherent and for this reason the residents chosen to participate should represent the values and wishes of that particular area. However, given that areas are organized on the basis of family units, their values and ethics, it is almost impossible for a local representative alone to be able to translate or express full social diversity and all the conflicts which therein occur.

The Nature Conservation Units' Management Councils and how they fit into Democratic Theory

Discussing participatory management in management councils in Brazil in the area of the environment must necessarily involve a theoretical discussion on environmental education and Freire's liberating and emancipatory education (QUINTAS, 2000; LOUREIRO, 2004; LOUREIRO et al., 2005; LOUREIRO; AZAZIEL, 2006; LOUREIRO; CUNHA, 2008; LIMONT, 2009). Our aim is to incorporate a discussion on the theory of governance and democratic management models. There is much talk about social participation in public spaces addressing nature conservation and social-environmental diversity in Brazil. However, little is known about what this term really means or its historical development.

Legislation on the management councils of Nature Conservation Units determines that in full protection units (no direct right of use) councils should be consultative, given the restrictions in the use of these areas, as established by law. In the case of sustainable use units, the law explicitly determines that councils should only be deliberative with regard to extractive reserves and sustainable development reserves. The nature of councils in other categories such as APA - Environmental Protection Area - and RPPN - Private Natural Heritage Reserve - are not specified by law. However, ICMBio [Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity] documents, such as their management reports (2010/2011), state that councils in sustainable use CUs (except for RDS - Sustainable Development Reserves and RESEX - Extractive Reserves) should also be consultative. This dichotomy between consultative and deliberative forums is found in overarching legislation, as is the case with SNUC - National System of Conservation Units. Definitions and restrictions are imposed before councils are set up. This does not mean that consultative councils cannot deliberate on specific matters. They can, as long as they act within the limits set for that particular UC, as established by the higher law.

According to the democratic theories referred to above, the two models of democracy which involve the participation of society beyond the vote and representation

are participatory and deliberative democracy. Therefore, UC management councils are spaces for deliberative democracy and not for individual and isolated opinions, given that they are public spaces which, according to Habermas, provide political legitimacy and where the communicative process of forming opinions and the collective will occur. However, if consultative (or even deliberative) councils are set up only to hear or inform other social subjects, even if they are institutionalized public spaces, they can only have an integrating and participatory effect (increasing the amount, but not necessarily the quality of participation) and would therefore fall within the conception of participatory democracy. Despite the fact that deliberative (or consultative) councils are by definition the appropriate spaces for deliberation, they can only be truly deliberative if they allow the impulses which come from the “lifeworld”^{vi} to reach the decision-making arenas set up by the democratic order. Public deliberation can only take place if participants are willing to revise their preferences in light of discussions, new information and the claims of fellow participants (CHAMBERS, 2003). If it is only a space for aggregating motivation and individual preferences, where citizen preferences are taken as given, then they are participatory rather than deliberative spaces (PEREIRA, 2007).

One of the criticisms made of the public sphere idealized by Habermas, where consensus emerges that influences the political sphere, relates to the fact that the inevitability of conflict does not guarantee that those participating in deliberative processes are willing to reach a consensus (SHAPIRO, 2003).

We need a democratic model capable of apprehending the nature of the political. This requires developing an approach which puts the question of power and antagonism at its very core. (...) It is for this reason that pluralist democracy cannot achieve a rational consensus within the public sphere. This consensus cannot exist. We have to accept that every consensus exists as a temporary result of a provisional hegemony, as part of the stabilization of power, and that it always entails some form of exclusion (MOUFFE, 2006, p. 173-175; 2003, p.112-117).

Other criticisms and complements to Habermas’ model of the public sphere include the recognition of the importance of “*counterpublics*” (FRASER, 1992, 2002), “*diasporic publics*” (GILROY, 1993) and “*deliberative publics*” (AVRITZER; COSTA, 2004). Young’s communicative democracy (2002) and Dryzek’s discursive democracy (2000) are also very important when analyzing the UC’s management councils. Often, some of the social subjects participating in UC management councils are used to a different type of rationality than that required for being heard in public spaces. Rational public discourse may not be a characteristic of these subjects who do, nevertheless, use narrative and testimony.

In addition to expanding deliberative processes through communicative and discursive democracy, another challenge is to elaborate a theory to connect them with other forms of political actions which take place in the public sphere (PEREIRA, 2007), and more importantly, to connect the public sphere with what happens in other preceding spheres such as the family.

The aim of analyzing the performance of the Guaratuba Environmental Protection Area’s Management Council (this UC encompasses the southern coast of the state of Paraná) is to be able to answer the questions of which democratic model is currently

employed in the UC's management councils and whether these spaces are sufficiently adequate for "social participation" and for managing common natural resources, in addition to finding out whether other types of decision-making (collective actions) occur and gain legitimacy within these spaces.

The Management Council of the Guaratuba Environmental Protection Area (APA)

The APA's Management Council was conceived in 2005 by the Paraná Environmental Institute (IAP) in Guaratuba (the IAP searched the six municipalities to identify already established collectivities). It was formed at the end of 2005 and recognized by decree n.22, 8th March 2006. It is a deliberative body with 30 representatives equally distributed between the government and civil society. It has a number of responsibilities and has been meeting frequently so as to assist in the APA's management. In 2006, meetings became training sessions for Council members. Formal and regular meetings resumed in 2007.

From 2007 to the end of 2012 the Council met 33 times. The researcher was present on 25 of these occasions. Another instrument used to collect data were the minutes of the meetings which took place during this period. Official documents, even when these are merely the record of filtered plenary discussions, are an important source of information which, together with the direct observation of meetings, allows researchers to capture the "council in action" (PERISSINOTTO e FUKS, 2007).

When considering the participation of Council members in meetings (all 30 seats), on average, 16 representatives were present during each meeting throughout the years the Council was active, where approximately half represented governmental sectors and half, civil society. In other words, parity was not only established by the laws regulating this space, it also occurred in practice with slight variations over time.

The SEET (State Tourism Department), the Municipal Administration of Matinhos and the Municipal Administration of Morretes were the government representatives most absent from meetings. In addition to the managing body (IAP), the following were most present: Municipal Administration of São José dos Pinhais (present in 79.3% of meetings), ICMBio (72.4%), Sanepar (65.5%) and Força Verde (Forestry Police Battalion – 65.5%). The most present representatives of civil society were: Guaratuba Productive Sector, represented by APAS (Pro-Sustainable Agriculture Association of Guaratuba) based in Cubatão/Caovi, present in 96.5% of meetings; São João river basin representative (Tijucas do Sul) based in São João de Baixo, present in 89.6% of meetings; Parati community (89.6%); Morretes Productive Sector, represented by AMORISA (Rio Sagrado Residents Association) (82.7%); and the NGOs, present in 79.3% of meetings. The most absent civil society representatives were the Paranaguá Productive Sector (present in only 3.4% of meetings); the Tijucas do Sul Productive Sector and the São José dos Pinhais Productive Sector, both present in 31% of meetings; Descoberto Community, whose seat is currently occupied by São Joãozinho residents, present in 44.8% of meetings and the representatives of the Canavieiras/Morretes Basin, present in 48.2% of meetings.

When we consider participation distribution by segments who initiated debates, it is clear that the governmental sectors were predominant. In addition to identifying who started discussions, the data collected allows us to observe which actors gave sequence to debates. Public bodies tended to initiate discussions (approximately four times more often, on average, than civil society sectors). This difference is halved in terms of giving sequence to debates.

The Council seems to have the following dynamics: state actors, especially the IAP, followed by NGOs initiate discussions, then the IAP takes the floor again, followed, less frequently, by representatives of the community and municipal productive sectors. It seems that the APA managing body dominates participation in the Council, which may be natural with regard to proposing discussions, given this entity presides over the Council and organizes the meetings' agenda. However, this does not mean that it needs to be the actor most likely to give sequence to discussions. This is partly explained by the fact that two or three IAP specialists are usually present during meetings.

Approximately 40% of matters addressed in the Council do not generate discussions. Furthermore, challenges, as defined by Perissinotto & Fuks (2007)^{vii}, only occurred in 13% of debates. This does not necessarily mean that the participatory experience lacks quality, given that various points in the agenda do not require discussion or lead to challenges (reports, project presentations, NGO and governmental programs), whilst other points are immediately voted on, for example, some licensing processes requiring the Council's consent.

When challenges do occur, they are mainly made by the communities/municipal productive sectors and, less frequently, by non-governmental organizations. The analysis therefore reveals not only the prevalence of three segments (managers - IAP; NGOs; communities/productive sectors) but also a polarization, mainly between the IAP and communities/productive sectors. These three types of actors are not only active in terms their participation in debates, but they also promote the confrontation of ideas.

The quality of deliberation can be assessed in terms of the most predominant types of decisions. The prevalence of "weak" (follow-ups and motions) and intermediary (approvals^{viii}) forms and the reduced number of resolutions and accountability sessions show that the Guaratuba APA Management Council (MC) is strong in terms of debating, but weak in terms of deliberating (Table 1). The UC management and IAP members are responsible for almost 40% of proposed actions. Although this figure is not as expressive when compared to the number of initiated debates, it consolidates the leadership of the managing body in the Council's decision-making process.

Table I. The nature of deliberations in the Guaratuba APA MC

Deliberation Form	Types of Decision	Quantity (%)
Weak	Follow-ups	35.20
	Motions	
Intermediary	Approvals	11.73
Strong	Resolutions	7.14
	Accountability	
	Sessions	
<i>Without deliberation or information.</i>		~ 46

Fonte: Mellinger, 2013.

Further to identifying the main actors and the existence of debates and challenges, as well as the types of deliberation, another way of classifying the MC's decision-making process is by analyzing its agenda. The quality of the decision-making process does not depend only on "who" debates and deliberates and "how" this occurs, but also on "what" takes up most space in the meetings' agenda.

"Public matters" are the main topics addressed at the Guaratuba APA MC, followed very closely by "internal matters", though this difference is not significant and the council seems to address both types of general topics in similar proportions. Among public matters, requests for the council to analyze and approve licenses predominate. There are also presentations of governmental and non-governmental programs and projects. There were some debates on policies in the environmental and social-environmental fields, such as discussions on the ICMS Ecológico [Ecological Tax on Services], changes in the APA's Management Plan (especially with regard to the use of aerial agrochemicals/spraying and reforestation with exotic species), as well as the creation of a new UC in the region. These issues resulted in substantive resolutions and in "accountability", but they did not dominate the APA MC agenda.

The presence/participation of Council members, the organization of seats and their representation, the organization and drafting of the Council's Action Plan, as well as the creation and the performance of technical chambers were the main issues in the MC's internal agenda. It can be seen that Guaratuba APA's MC spends a considerable amount of effort and time on internal procedure issues and in analyzing licenses. Less time is devoted to discussing and deliberating on matters related to policy.

According to the "Assessment of Federal Conservation Units Councils" conducted by ICMBio in 2011 by means of questionnaires to UC leaders and other ICMBio staff, the main agenda topics discussed by UC deliberative councils were the following: "use of natural resources", "management plan" and "monitoring", in other words, public matters. Internal matters such as "function" and "how the council operates" were rarely mentioned.

Perissinotto e Fuks (2007) analyzed municipal councils in the areas of health, social assistance and children and adolescents' rights in Curitiba. They found that discussions on public matters prevailed, in particular substantive topics. Little time was spent on issues which related exclusively to internal procedures.

Pereira (2007) argues that deliberation only takes place when there is a reconsideration of actors' preferences and not merely the aggregation of these interests. This supposition was methodologically applied to debates at the Guaratuba APA MC which involved challenges, that is, where records showed that interventions by a second actor clearly opposed interventions by those who had initiated the debate. This revealed that in a total of 26 challenges, in 30% of cases actors aggregated interests either by following up on proposals or through approval by the majority.

However, in 23%^{ix} of challenges, actors were able to reconsider their preferences. In other words, they changed their opinion and personal or institutional position in favour of a resolution, that is, in the view of Perissinotto e Fuks (2007), a strong deliberation. It is, of course, possible that "aggregation of interests" may have occurred in other debates and not only when there were "challenges". However, our analysis of these two categories was restricted to occasions when "preferences were reconsidered", as it seems implicit that this could only occur subsequent to a challenge. Following the method based on Pereira (2007), it seems that the Guaratuba APA MC does not deliberate very much.

Narratives and testimonies may be ways in which subjects used to different rationalities other than rational public discourse are able to express themselves. The fact that these may exist in public spaces reveals an extended democracy (YOUNG, 2002; DRYZEK, 2000) which goes beyond deliberative democracy. Until 2012, in the Guaratuba APA MC, there were seven episodes in 33 meetings where this communication device was used as a mechanism for making oneself understood on occasions where rationality was no longer possible or because it was the only way people could fully express themselves, either in a conflict situation or as a peaceful way of challenging the status quo.

Community/productive sector representatives from the Guaratuba Bay or rural regions narrated or gave testimony of their confrontations with logging companies and the forestry police, finding other forms of expressing their dissatisfaction and the reasons why they participated in the Council. Managers and IAP representatives also gave emotive testimonies in situations where there were strong conflicts in the plenary, expressing their frustration with the lack of commitment of Council members, persecutions they had experienced or the fact they held positions incompatible with the state organization they represented. Despite the fact that these narratives represent different forms of communication and ways of expressing dissatisfaction, conflicts, resistance and negotiation, they are not well valued or understood by the plenary.

Here, it is worth reflecting on the existence or absence of representation. This may be the reason - together with the prevalence of weak deliberations - why the Guaratuba APA MC still devotes much of its time to internal affairs during ordinary meetings. Civil society subjects fully committed to participation are very assiduous (according to the data on the presence in meetings percentage described above), particularly the representatives of APAS, São João de baixo, Parati and AMORISA.

It is worth highlighting that these representations involve groups of producers/small farmers who have been involved in this process since the initial stages of the GAP (Guaratuba APA Planning Support Group) and the protests which occurred in the city of Guaratuba to change the UC's Management Plan. They have strengthened their participation in the MC from its implementation, where many of the people involved at the beginning have been re-elected to the same positions. These groups were already socially organized and formally established in productive collectivities for the cultivation of banana and rice or as residents associations. Thus, these groups already had a certain amount of symbolic capital^x recognized by the Guaratuba society and were able to mobilize resources, people and guarantee spaces. Although the Guaratuba APA MG was proposed by the State, as part of its public policies, it is also the result of a context of social struggle in which family farmers and small family businesses who did not want to change their traditional production methods got together and, today, continue to be actively involved and ensure that the APA management address their demands, such as the aerial spraying approved by the Council, resulting in changes to the MP. However, in other areas of Guaratuba Bay, these groups are considered as the "elite" of the communities and their demands as very specific to their own needs.

Other areas around the bay are either not represented on the Guaratuba APA MC or there are problems or difficulties regarding their participation. For example, although Parati has a representative, this person is an outsider who, despite owning land in the area, does not reside there and is not native. That is, even with the best of intentions, this person would not be able to represent all the demands of natives and residents, their specificities, values and culture. However, some natives refuse to participate in this forum, as they do not recognize it as a legitimate space for expressing their aspirations, the dynamics of their lives and the management of common natural resources based on family organization and on their daily needs.

The representative of the Descoberto region gave up his seat instead of giving up a day's work. This is one of the main reasons employed to justify non-participation. To participate in a Council meeting is to lose a day's work and social reproduction and subsistence is dependent on daily work, in contrast to state organization representatives for whom participating in the Council is part of their work routine. São Joãozinho took over the Descoberto seat, receiving the support of the University of Paraná (UFPR) Litoral research/outreach department. That is, they were encouraged to take over the empty seat by external agents and they are in some way guided by them during all meetings. The question then arises: to what extent are these representatives present through their own initiative?

The seat belonging to the fishing colony was never occupied by a representative of this sector. It is held instead by a leader of the Caieiras Community, the son of a fisherman who later represented Aguamar (the Guaratuba Association of Mariculture Workers)^{xi}. One of the most important issues for the managing body has been why it has never managed to involve a representative of the local fishing community and how to ensure the artisanal fishermen are more organized so as to participate in the Council. It is a common complaint that artisanal/traditional fishermen are not organized and difficult to deal with.

However, a fishing colony leader argues that it is also difficult to maintain talks with the State. For fourteen years, he has been the leader of the fishing colony^{xii} and has reported the impasses and conflicts with the IAP. He even describes past occasions in which the fishermen were treated violently by the forestry police. He claims that some of the most significant conflicts relate to the state environment department which restricts fishing through a number of decrees with which the fishermen do not agree. For example, artisanal fishermen are not allowed to fish with nets during weekends and holidays, when priority is given to amateur fishermen and tourists. It also established a closure period for sea bass between November and January, but without granting them the right to receive a fishing benefit during the closure period. At other times they were called by the State to discuss rules and regulations before these were instituted. However, meetings revealed a disregard for their knowledge and their needs.

Until 1999, the minutes of the Guaratuba fishing colony only recorded changes in leadership and the community's financial situation. By 2000, the first meeting registered questioned the mayor and IAP representatives present about the creation of laws (without the community's knowledge), as well as the violent and humiliating attitude of IBAMA, and in particular the Forestry Police, towards them. Minutes always portray conflicts and discussions on fishing, sometimes with the presence of environmental bodies, municipal departments and councillors, and members of parliament. However, these documents cannot confirm that effective decisions and deliberations were made.

Within this context, the leaders of the fishing community believe that "the environment" - in reference to environmental policies for the area - does not exist. Instead, there are some individuals who protect the environment and others who defend their private interests. Thus, they opt not to participate in the Guaratuba APA MC, because they see it as the extension of the State, where they will only be heard, with no real results. In other words, there is simple participation, but no real deliberation. On the other hand, native Guaratuba Bay fishermen had a number of complaints about the fishing colony and its management which seems to be in power for ever. The fishing colony is there mainly to address labour issues and does not effectively act as a trade union or an organization for defending rights.

It is worth noting that the traditional fishermen, namely the natives, not only fish, but perform other activities, or did so until very recently, and that the base of their social organization is the family. It may be that they do not see the fishing community organization as a body that could represent the entire range of their activities (subsistence activities and income generation) which, indeed, it does not. Nevertheless, it is able to provide assistance in terms of supporting social reproduction, in accessing the INSS [National Institute for Social Security], pension rights, fishing benefits and maternity leave.

Thus, the fishing colony ends up acting more as a social broker or mediator than a self-organized body for class struggle. Indeed, this 'class' only seems to exist within the social imaginary, since in practice there are too many internal conflicts and different ideas, a web of personal networks to access the State. Despite the IAP's attempts to include the Guaratuba fishing colony in the Guaratuba APA MC, this did not occur. The Council is still seen as an arm of the state, where a number of stereotypes, unresolved situations

and confrontations persist, in addition to other factors which are so deeply rooted in the popular imagination that they are difficult to dispel.

At one APA meeting a fisherman and mariculture worker from Caieiras stated that the Council should go to the community, given that in that space, which gathered together the community's elite (Cubatão) and poor communities (São Joãozinho), no positive outcomes would be reached. According to him, the committee should go to the community to find out whether it really wanted to be part of the group. It was not enough to wait for the community to come to the Council, because it would not do so. He later referred to the fact he had lost a day's work to come to the meeting. In other words, the decision not to participate is taken because of the need to manage family affairs and because of the history of problems with environmental bodies, which at the beginning had been undeniably more coercive and punitive in their approach than participatory, deliberative, communicative or discursive.

Despite the efforts of both the MC and the UC managing body (IAP) in discussing the empty spaces in almost all Council meetings and in including other "native" representatives, many rural areas and local social actors still do not participate because they do not recognize it as a legitimate space. The main reason for non-participation is because they do not think that participation is important and because by participating they validate and acknowledge the entire historical process of their exclusion. It is not because they are apathetic, and lack organization or a political culture^{xiii}.

It is important to have a more effective and real relationship (which is no longer lost in history and only present as memories) between the State and rural areas, localities, small villages and productive/extractive groups. It is important to have a face to face relationship with Family Units. For this to occur, both the State and society must move toward each other. Each party must get to know and legitimize the other. It is essential to acknowledge that there are no higher or unique forums for decision-making, but that each space (be these family units, the local territory with its own dynamics, or public spaces) is recognized and respected as forums for managing common natural resources.

Some conclusions

The governance of common natural resources in Guaratuba Bay involves a type of management which encompasses individual choices, sets of rules and customary values, the result of traditional customs and practices of the native population. The acceptance of rules is guaranteed through respect and is not necessarily negotiated or agreed upon. In addition, the governance of natural common goods is also managed via institutional arrangements such as associations, assemblies, negotiations, decisions, agreements, rules, councils, governments and laws. Despite the presence of these different processes they are not well integrated. They are managed collectively, but there is little interaction between the more official bodies and other spheres, and vice-versa. Management based on family units and in the imaginary of the territory is partially or totally invisible to the more formal spheres of governance. The native population does not seem to confer legitimacy to official forums (be these management councils or formal associations).

The Guaratuba APA Management Council is a democratic and participatory space. Nevertheless, it remains weak in terms of deliberation. Although it is part of an important public sphere for managing the common resources of the Guaratuba Bay, it is not sufficient to encompass the impulses which emerge from the lifeworld^{xiv} and from the complex interaction between society and nature and the cultural plurality and social-space which this relation involves.

If in addition to the management councils and community associations, the governance of the Guaratuba Bay's common natural resources is not linked to the "family unit" sphere, it could just be reproducing a "harmonic" and simplistic model of community, as well as democratic management models which are only aggregating. Neither the inherent "community" conflicts nor their dynamics based on Family Units are taken into account. Often organizations based on association and a care for "community" are forcibly taken as variables when they do not exist *a priori*. Preferences of individuals are aggregated and taken as given as if it were not possible for social (collective) subjects to reconsider their preferences through discussion and practice.

A reinforcement of more individualized mechanisms of families is observed as a form of common natural resources management in Guaratuba Bay, as well as intervention and control by the State through complex and often selective and excluding legislation. In other words, in principle, forms of common natural resources management such as the common use of land for cultivation and the use of water and mangrove space, based on respecting those who arrive first to fish or collect crabs. These forms of management, although they are not explicit or conscious rules of collective management of common resources, become invisible in face of other forms of management which prevail, such as environmental legislation. Indeed, they are invisible to the State and part of society because in practice they continue to exist and, to some degree, resist.

What exists in Guaratuba Bay is already a form of hybrid management or governance. Indeed, it is likely to be very common in many other regions in the country where those who practice it probably do so unconsciously: the State with its laws, management councils, communities and family units. If existing models of democracy cannot encompass the fullness of diversity and complexity of these processes, it cannot think that it has reached the end of history, that this type of democracy is the final stage and that there is nothing beyond it.

Notes

i Channelling the flow of communication from the lifeworld to the public sphere generally takes place via the set of voluntary associations which are not linked to the market or the State, the so-called civil society (HABERMAS, 1990, apud AVRITZER; COSTA, 2004).

ii The UCs are natural areas primarily set up to protect and conserve biodiversity with categories and specific objectives which range from the perspective of fully protecting nature, where only indirect uses are allowed (such as tourism, research and environmental education) to a perspective of the sustainable use of part of the natural resources by the local population (SNUC 2000).

iii These are natural resources which are not provided such as fish, surface and underground water, as well as forests. Common goods are resources which can be identified by their characteristic of subtraction, that is, the ability each user has to subtract part of other people's prosperity. A second characteristic is the difficulty or even the impossibility of excluding

- potential users or controlling their access to these resources (SCHMITZ et al., 2009). The term common good is also used in exclusive reference to the communal ownership regime (FEENY et al., 2001, p. 21). In this case, “natural common goods” refers to a broader use of the term “natural resources”, given that it can simply indicate an utilitarian view of nature.
- iv Residents of the Guaratuba Bay who were born on their farms, describe and identify themselves as “natives”. They also employ the terms “sitiantes” (farmers) and “colonos” (settlers), but mainly use “natives”. A native can come from a specific locality, but they can also belong to the Guaratuba Bay as a whole. The children of residents recently arrived “from outside”, and born somewhere in the Guaratuba Bay area are not considered native. That is, for someone to be native they need to have been born in the area and be the descendants of a mixture of indigenous and European culture, in other words, a “caçara”, the inhabitant of the southern and south-eastern coast of Brazil, as described in other studies.
 - v Somewhere where fishing vessels and equipment are kept.
 - vi According to Habermas, the lifeworld is the day-to-day world, where forms of cultural, societal and personal reproduction are integrated through consensual rules accepted by all participants.
 - vii “Challenges” relate to an intervention by a second actor who explicitly opposes the person who initiated the debate.
 - viii According to Perissinotto e Fuks (2007), “approval” is a generic category, described as intermediary, and relates to all decisions taken by the Council which are not merely formal (such as follow-ups and motions), nor are they particularly substantive, such as resolutions and accountability sessions. A “resolution” is a decision taken by the Council on a particular aspect of policy which becomes a state regulation. They are “strong modalities” of decision-making, which potentially make both the public administration and private agents liable for decisions taken.
 - ix Other challenges put forward by different actors were simply “left hanging” in the plenary. They were not followed up, stifled or left to be discussed on other occasions.
 - x According to Bourdieu (2000), symbolic capital is a form of power linked to the prestige or charisma which an individual or institution holds in a particular field.
 - xi Aguamar was established in 2004 to organize the emerging mariculture activity and its workers. It also came about as a response to pressure from IBAMA (Brazilian Institute for Environmental and Renewable Natural Resources) regarding the legality of this activity in public areas. As the fishing community did not come forward and did not support this incipient activity, it was necessary to formalize it by creating an association. The current president of the Association is an “outsider”, from Cabaraquara.
 - xii According to the current leadership, the fishing community has been in existence for 50 years. The first statute was drawn up in 1983, given there were not enough registered members before this date to be granted association status in accordance to Federal legislation. It was only officially registered in 2001. The statute was not drawn up by the local fishermen themselves, but it was approved using a model from the National Confederation of Fishermen.
 - xiii According to Rennó (1998), many contemporary authors have studied political culture. The general substance of their research relates to the importance of values, feelings, beliefs and knowledge used to explain political behaviour. Almond (1990) defines political culture as the set of subjective orientations of a particular population. It involves knowledge, beliefs, feelings and commitment toward political values and the political reality. Its content is the result of socialization during childhood, education, exposure to the media, adult experiences in dealings with the government, with society and the economic performance of the country. For further information on this topic see Rennó (1998).
 - xiv According to Habermas, as previously described.

References

- ADAMS, C. As populações caçaras e o mito do bom selvagem: a necessidade de uma nova abordagem interdisciplinar. *Revista de Antropologia* 43 (1): 145-182. 2000.
- AVRITZER, L. e COSTA, S. Teoria Crítica, Democracia e Esfera Pública: concepções e usos na América Latina. *Dados* 47(4): 703-728. 2004.
- BALZON, D. R. Avaliação econômica dos produtos florestais não madeiráveis na Área de Proteção Ambiental – APA – de Guaratuba, Paraná. **Tese (Doutorado em Ciências Florestais)**. Universidade Federal do Paraná. Curitiba, 2002.

- BOURDIEU, P. Espaço social e gênese das classes. In: **O poder simbólico**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, p. 133-161, 2000.
- BRASIL. Ministério do Meio Ambiente. Lei Federal no 9.985/00, de 18 de julho de 2000. Instituição do Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 18 de jul. de 2000.
- CHAMBERS, S. Deliberative Democratic Theory. **Annual Review of Political Science** 6. 2003.
- COELHO, V.S.P. e NOBRE, M. **Participação e Deliberação. Teoria Democrática e Experiências Institucionais no Brasil Contemporâneo**. São Paulo: Editora 34. 2004.
- COHEN, J. e ARATO, A. **Civil Society and Political Theory**. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press. 1992.
- DAGNINO, E.; OLVERA, A.J. e PANFICHI, A. Para uma outra leitura da disputa pela construção democrática na América Latina. In: Dagnino, E.; Olvera, A.J. & Panfichi, A. **A Disputa pela Construção Democrática na América Latina**. Unicamp, Paz e Terra. 2006.
- DIEGUES, A. C. **Pescadores, camponeses e trabalhadores do mar**. São Paulo : Ática, 1983.
- DIEGUES, A. C. S. et al., Diversidade Biológica e Culturas Tradicionais: O Caso das Comunidades Caiçaras. **Documento apresentado na IV Conferência da ICUN**. São José, Costa Rica, 1988.
- DOWNS, A. **Uma teoria econômica da democracia**. Edusp, São Paulo. 1999.
- DRYZEK, J. **Deliberative democracy and beyond liberals, critics, contestations**. New York: Oxford University Press. 2000.
- FEENY, D. et al. A tragédia dos comuns: vinte e dois anos depois. Tradução André de Castro C. Moreira. In: DIEGUES, A. C.; MOREIRA, A. C. C. (Orgs.). **Espaços e recursos naturais de uso comum**. São Paulo: NUPAUB/LASTROP-USP, 2001. p. 17-42. (Original: 1990).
- FERREIRA, M. R. Comunidades rurais de Guaratuba – Paraná: os limites e as possibilidades da opção extrativista como meio de vida no contexto do desenvolvimento rural sustentável. **Tese (Doutorado em Ciências Agrárias)**. Universidade Federal do Paraná. Curitiba, 2010.
- FRASER, N. Rethinking the public sphere: a contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. In: Calhoun, C. (org.). **Habermas and the Public Sphere**. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press. 1992.
- FRASER, N. **Transnationalizing the public sphere**. Nova York, manuscrito inédito. 2002.
- FUNDAÇÃO SOS MATA ATLÂNTICA. **Dossiê Mata Atlântica**. São Paulo, 1992.
- GARCIA JR. A. **O Sul: Caminho do Roçado**. Brasília/São Paulo: Editora UNB/Marco Zero. 1990.
- GILROY, P. **The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness**. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press. 1993.

- HABERMAS, J. **Direito e democracia – entre facticidade e validade**. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, v. 1 e 2. 1997.
- HEREDIA, B. M. A. de. **A morada da vida: trabalho familiar de pequenos produtores do Nordeste do Brasil**. Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra, 1979.
- INSTITUTO CHICO MENDES DE CONSERVAÇÃO DA BIODIVERSIDADE. Ministério do Meio Ambiente. **Relatório de Gestão**, 2010.
- INSTITUTO CHICO MENDES DE CONSERVAÇÃO DA BIODIVERSIDADE. Ministério do Meio Ambiente. **Relatório de Gestão**, 2011.
- INSTITUTO CHICO MENDES DE CONSERVAÇÃO DA BIODIVERSIDADE. Ministério do Meio Ambiente. **Diagnóstico dos Conselhos de Unidades de Conservação Federais**, 2011.
- LIMONT, M. Educação e participação social na APA de Guaraqueçaba: a capacitação como possibilidade na mediação de conflitos ambientais. **Dissertação (Mestrado em EdCUação)**. Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, 2009.
- LOUREIRO, C. F. B. Educação ambiental e gestão participativa na explicitação e resolução de conflitos. **Gestão em Ação** 7(1): 37-50. 2004.
- LOUREIRO, C. F. B. et al. **Educação ambiental e gestão participativa em unidades de conservação**. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: IBAMA / IBASE, 2005.
- LOUREIRO, C. F. B.; AZAZIEL, M. Áreas protegidas e “inclusão social”: problematização do paradigma analítico linear e seu separatismo na gestão ambiental. In: IRVING, M. (Org.). **Áreas protegidas e inclusão social**. São Paulo: Garamond, 2006. p. 115-129.
- LOUREIRO, C.F.B. e CUNHA, C. C. Educação ambiental e gestão participativa de unidades de conservação: elementos para se pensar a sustentabilidade democrática. **Ambiente & Sociedade** 11(2): 237-253. 2008.
- MILL, J. S. **Principles of political economy**. London: Penguin Books. 1970.
- MOUFFE, C. Cidadania, democracia e a questão do pluralismo. **Política & Sociedade** 3: 11-26. 2003.
- MOURA, M. **Os Herdeiros da Terra**. São Paulo: Hucitec. 1978.
- PATEMAN, C. **Participação e Teoria Democrática**. São Paulo: Editora Paz e Terra. 1992.
- PEREIRA, M. A. G. Modelos democráticos deliberativos e participativos – similitudes, diferenças e desafios. In: Dagnino, E. & Tatagiba, L. **Democracia, sociedade civil e participação**. Chapecó: Argos editora universitária. 2007.
- PERISSINOTTO, R. M. e FUKS, M. Recursos, influência política e cultura cívica nos conselhos gestores de Curitiba. In: Dagnino, E. & Tatagiba, L. **Democracia, sociedade civil e participação**. Chapecó: Argos editora universitária. 2007.
- QUINTAS, J. S. Por uma edCUação ambiental emancipatória: considerações sobre a formação do edCUador para atuar no processo de gestão ambiental. In: **Quintas, J. S. (Org.). Pensando e praticando a edCUação ambiental na gestão do meio ambiente**. Brasília: IBAMA, p. 11-19. 2000.

- RENNÓ, L. Teoria da Cultura Política: vícios e virtudes. **BIB 45**: 71-92. 1988.
- SAMPAIO, T. **O tupi na geografia nacional**. São Paulo: Cia Editora Nacional, 1987.
- SCHNEIDER, S. Teoria Social, agricultura familiar e pluriatividade. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais 51 (18)**: 99-120. 2003.
- SHAPIRO, I. Optimal deliberation. In: Fishkin, J; Laslett, P. **Debating deliberative democracy**. Oxford: Blackwell publishing, p. 80-101. 2003.
- SONDA, C. Comunidades Rurais Tradicionais da Área de Proteção Ambiental Estadual de Guaratuba: Caracterização Sócio-econômica e utilização dos recursos vegetais silvestres. 193 f. **Tese (Doutorado em Ciências Florestais)**. Universidade Federal do Paraná. Curitiba, 2002.
- WOORTMANN, K. “Com parente não se negUeia”. O Campesinato como ordem moral. In: **Anuário Antropológico 87**, Editora UNB/Tempo Brasileiro. 1990.
- WOORTMANN, K Migração, família e campesinato. In: WELCH. C. A. et al. (org.). **Camponeses Brasileiros. Leituras e Interpretações Clássicas**. São Paulo/Brasília: UNESP/NEAD. 2009 (1990).
- YOUNG, I. M. **Inclusion and Democracy**. 2008.

Submitted on: 15/08/2014.

Accepted on: 23/01/2015.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1809-4422ASOCEX01V1822015en>

DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION IN THE MANAGEMENT OF COMMON NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE NATIVE POPULATIONS IN THE SOUTHERN COAST OF PARANÁ

LARISSA MELLINGER
DIMAS FLORIANI

Abstract: O intuito deste trabalho foi contextualizar o que hoje se chama de “participação social” ou “gestão participativa”, dentro da conservação ambiental ou socioambiental no Brasil, através da teoria social e política, principalmente sobre democracia participativa e deliberativa, suas críticas e complementações. Um estudo de caso junto a populações “tradicionais” ao redor da baía de Guaratuba, litoral sul paranaense, indicou que as unidades familiares são a base de organização do sítio e da reprodução social do “nativo”, onde se estabelecem relações e regras de uso dos bens naturais comuns, baseadas na diversidade de suas atividades e nas suas decisões diárias. O conselho gestor da APA de Guaratuba, *locus* oficial de participação social da arena ambiental na região do litoral sul do Paraná, apesar de ser uma importante instância de decisão e consequente gestão dos bens naturais comuns na baía de Guaratuba, está aquém na deliberação e possui lacunas de representação da sociedade civil que na verdade só retratam uma herança histórica de conflitos e desacordos dos “nativos” com os órgãos e as leis ambientais que não ajudaram a construir efetivamente. Essas diferentes esferas de gestão dos bens naturais comuns ainda estão pouco integradas e as instâncias oficiais democráticas não são suficientes para lidar com toda a diversidade cultural e de situações que permeiam a relação natureza e sociedade.

Palavras-Chave: Democracia participativa e deliberativa; Conselho Gestor; Unidade Familiar; Gestão dos bens naturais comuns.

Resumen: El propósito de este texto trató de involucrar lo que se conoce por “participación social” o “gestión participativa” en la conservación ambiental o socioambiental en Brasil, por intermedio de la teoría social y política, en especial de la democracia participativa y deliberativa, sus críticas y complementariedades. Un estudio de caso con poblaciones “tradicionales” alrededor de la bahía de Guaratuba, litoral sur de Paraná, demostró que las unidades familiares son la base de la organización del sítio (parcela) y de la reproducción social del “nativo”, donde se establecen relaciones y reglas de uso de los bienes naturales

comunes, en base a la diversidad de sus actividades y en sus tomas de decisiones cotidianas. El consejo gestor del Area de Protección Ambiental (APA) de Guaratuba, lugar oficial de participación social en la arena ambiental de la región litoranea sur de Paraná, es insuficiente para deliberar y posee vacíos de representación de la sociedad civil y que además reproduce una herencia histórica de conflictos y desentendimientos de los pobladores con los órganos oficiales y las leyes ambientales; a pesar de se tratar de una importante instancia para la toma de decisiones, los “nativos” no se sienten totalmente responsables por esta organización. Las distintas esferas de gestión de los bienes naturales comunes no estan integradas y las instancias oficiales democráticas no son suficientes para lidiar con toda la diversidad cultural y con las demás situaciones que se interponen en la relación sociedad-naturaleza.

Palabras-Clave: Democracia participativa y deliberativa; Consejo de Gestión; Unidad Familiar; Gestión de los bienes naturales comunes.

Abstract: This project aims to contextualize what today is known in environmental or socio-environmental conservation in Brazil as “social participation” or “participatory management”, by using social and political theory, more specifically on participatory and deliberative democracy, its criticisms and complementation. A case study of the traditional population around Guaratuba Bay, southern coast of Parana State, Brazil, showed that family units are the foundations of the local organization and social reproduction of the native population, where relations and rules for the use of common natural resources were established based on pluri-activity and on their daily decisions. The management council of Guaratuba APA (a protected area category established by Brazilian legislation) - the official social participation forum on environmental issues - despite being an important decision-making body, affecting the management of common natural resources on Garatuba Bay, presents weak deliberation and is deficient in terms of its civil society representation. It reflects a legacy of conflicts and disagreement between the local community and environmental agencies and legislation in which civil society did not effectively take part in drafting. These different levels of management of common natural resources are still poorly integrated and democratic official bodies are not sufficiently adequate to address all the cultural diversity and the different situations that pervade the relationship between nature and society.

Keywords: Participatory and deliberative democracy; Management Council; Family Units. Governance of common natural resources.
