



The Entrepreneurial State and the impact of the New Managerial Ideology

El estado emprendedor y el impacto del Neomanagerialismo

EDGAR VARELA BARRIOS*

Clasificación COLCIENCIAS-PUBLINDEX: Artículo de Investigación

Recibido: 18/04/2017

Revisado: 6/05/2017

Aceptado: 1/11/2017

Abstract

This article analyzes the Entrepreneurial State transformation, in transit from the previous model of interventionism and monopolization of many management functions and provision of public goods – Fordist Capitalism, Fordism itself – until the current phase, which began decades ago and driven by Globalism: the transnationalization of political liberalization and open markets. In this new phase, the state employer has not disappeared, leaving aside their monopolistic nature, but has become an important business operator and a key factor in the accumulation and reproduction of capital in all business areas, articulated forms of private and New Managerial Management. This, under the ideologies and techniques from the New Public Management, that converging patterns of action and ending the boundaries between private and public. The article documents the new features of the corporate state, under the principle of economic autarky and the development of sophisticated forms of control and relational power as its main lines of action in a context of broad commercialization of the public, and forms of partnerships between public-private.

Keywords: Public bureaucracy, New managerial management, Entrepreneurial state, Liberal reforms, Globalism.

Resumen

Este artículo analiza las transformaciones del Estado empresarial, pasando desde un modelo de intervencionismo y monopolización de funciones de gestión y provisión de bienes públicos, como el Capitalismo Fordista, hasta la fase actual, que comenzó hace décadas, impulsado por el Globalismo: la transnacionalización de la liberalización política y los mercados abiertos. En esta etapa, el empleador estatal no ha desaparecido, sino que ha perdido su carácter monopolístico, convirtiéndose así en un operador empresarial y factor clave de la acumulación de capital, articulándose a formas de privatismo y de gestión neomanagerial. Todo ello bajo las ideologías y técnicas provenientes del *New Public Management*, que confluyen en patrones de actuación que hacen de este modo complejas las fronteras entre lo público, lo privado y lo público no estatal. El artículo documenta las nuevas características del estado corporativo, bajo el principio de autarquía económica y el desarrollo de formas sofisticadas de control y poder relacional como sus principales líneas de acción en un contexto de amplia comercialización de lo público y formas de asociación entre lo público-privado.

Palabras clave: Burocracia pública, Nueva gestión gerencial, Estado emprendedor, Reformas liberales, Globalismo.

* Professor, School of Management Sciences, Universidad del Valle. Philosopher and MA in History, Universidad del Valle, PhD. in Business Administration (Management Option), Université de Montreal. Directs the research group "Public Policy and Management, Category A – Colciencias e-mail: edgar.varela@correounivalle.edu.co

Como citar: Varela Barrios, E. (2017). The Entrepreneurial State and the impact of the New Managerial Ideology. *Revista de Administración Pública del GLAP*, 1(1), 21-39.

Introduction

Over the past few years, the transformations of the government bureaucracy in its business model have been characterized, due to the process of implementation of neoliberal reforms and the emergence of new approaches of management in contemporary capitalism, hegemonic today, early this century (Varela, 2006, 2005, 2008, Stiglitz, 2002, Negri and Hardt, 2002).

The paradigm of welfare state interventionism and the welfare state capitalism itself, prior to the expansion of neoliberal global model on the planet today, tends to be replaced by the contemporary logic - in the spaces of the lifeworld and the world work - of capital accumulation and concentration that occur beyond the territorial states and articulated to global markets (Olsen, 2004; Evans, 2002; Boltansky and Chiapello, 1999).

We cannot forget that the capital has become global, as well, as the capacities for logistics, distribution, and consumption. Since the 50's until today, the bulk of the production, distribution, market, financial management, etc., is heading towards the world market. The performance of assets in the world market primarily instrumented through figures such as relocation and deterritorialization¹. On the other hand, based on the complexity of the context in which public policy act, we should emphasize how the experimental innovation in large corporate organizations private and public ventures, competes constantly with the technical conditions from which this is achieved again innovation.

This continuing transformation of the environments and forms of competition, explains why today has revived in the management literature the concept of governance, which in Spanish translates as *gobernanza*. For most of the interpreters of the NPM, this notion is operationalized or concrete to illustrate the phenomenon by which the state becomes a coordinator of shares of public and private actors, leaving the cen-

tral state model, whose essential characteristic was located at as the central governmental apparatus, which articulated the world of public policy (Beck, 2002).

Despite the loss of the centrality of the governmental apparatus throughout the world, and even though the drives toward a radical scheme to dismantle the welfare state, we observe a presence still quite strong, vigorous and dynamic called corporate state. It has not disappeared – as some of the neoliberal doomsayers predicted – business as the State still has a significant position in the markets and the provision of public goods of strategic or commercial.

This article will show, therefore, the main performance characteristics of the corporate state, its management methods and the convergence between public and private, the challenges of the growing empowerment of the power of Business Management, after the foundations of autocracy and compared away to traditional exercise of political power, and the impacts of globalization on the management of state enterprises, and partnerships forms with public corporate conglomerates, mixed and private. Finally, we discuss from a critical perspective consolidated financial strategies of control and organizational power of them.

Ontological corporate state

We are far from cliché scheme that implies a complete withdrawal of state's role as employer. However, the performance of entrepreneurial state is very different with respect to the classic Fordist Capitalism in which emerged the figure of the state as the employer. In the relatively recent past, the former state-owned enterprises, both industrial and even those that provided services in areas such as health or other fields of operation of public goods, monopolistic enterprises were generally not controlled captive markets liberalization in prices or rates for these services (Down, 1967; Dunsire, 1978).

¹ These two aspects are very evident in the case of Europe, which cannot export enough because their salaries are too high, and then it must be located in places where their costs are reduced through wages, for example, Southeast Asia. This is evident in the famous case of Wal-Mart, corporate marketing, in which the vast majority of its products are Chinese, Mexican and Brazilian. Thus, the welfare state must conform to the third world wages as a result of heightened competition at the phenomenon of globalization, leading to high levels of insecurity and uncertainty.

To this end, we review the experience of a general outbreak throughout the world capitalism, between an old model in which the state monopoly emerged as an actor under the schemes of the welfare state, state interventionism and the logic of subsidiarity; for a new model that begins with the withdrawal of the state of many of the public dimensions, specific to the aforementioned condition, monopolize the supply of goods and services. In this regard, some critics of dismantling the old welfare state, suggests a return to basic principles and rights-welfare model, and propose to recover:

(...) Some democratic republican state functions related to the provision of social services to the public that has traditionally been free, democratic and socially egalitarian. These services are the minimum necessary for people not to degrade to a state of slavery, barbarism, and savagery ... it is important to emphasize how the class essence of the state influences the ways in which their rulers, in turn, provide these social services to the population. To the extent that the ruling classes of the state away from its minimum mandate of providing such services in the way mentioned here, in the same proportion quantitative and qualitative undermine the democratic principles of public interest, the public domain before which supposedly should be imposed on the state. The quantity and quality of which the state deprived such services to the public, while the same measure that degrades, or alienates the public. (Muela, 2005, p. 3).

Looking at hindsight, we recognize the state enterprise as a central category in sociological analysis, political and managerial. This corresponds to the excesses of capitalism at the time requiring a transformation of the old state police department, in a complex multifaceted protein almost corporate. Public organizations, that sprang up in various corners of the world and in almost all fields of business and commercial. The idea was, at that time, to respond to several principles that explain the emergence of state-owned enterprises:

a. Promoting development and safeguards of the dynamics of capital accumulation. In

the early twentieth century, and throughout almost the whole century, the state built social infrastructure, such as universities, institutions or schools, hospitals, clinics, nursing homes and others, from which the call was offered public health. As stated in a pioneering study on the role of state enterprises, in order to carry out public policies in Latin America, written by CLAD in their early presence in the regional institutions:

First, much of joining the state sector utilities - electricity, railroads - seems to be the result of similar processes. In almost all countries, the investments were made by foreign capital at the end of last century and early decades of the present [twentieth century], based on long-term concessions. In subsequent periods, tariff controls and the proximity of the dates of expiry of the concessions made to suspend further investment and adequate maintenance levels. The facilities are deteriorating, the quality of the services reach unacceptable levels and will create situations in which nationalization seems the only reasonable solution. For a large number of companies can be found in such processes, the reasons for joining the public sector. Second, it can be seen that among the oldest state enterprises set an important set of development banks and financial institutions, one of whose main objectives was to develop a national industry. Industrial Bank and the Banco Minero del Peru, Corporación de Fomento de la Producción (CORFO) in Chile, in Mexico Nacional Financiera, the Industrial Bank of Argentina (now the National Development Bank), Banco Industrial de Venezuela and Corporación Venezolana de Fomento are all examples that correspond to the thirties and forties. Correspond to the early stages of import substitution industrialization and through its long-term loans or the formation of joint ventures contributed mainly to consolidate the national industrial bourgeoisie (Boneo, 1979, pp. 76 - 77).

Thus, we explain a surge from numerous statist political processes and to mobilize behind the flags of the nationalization of natural resources, strategic industries, and the area of public services. Populist parties and movements of the type APRA in Peru, Peronism in Argentina, the

PRI in Mexico, the Estado Novo in Brazil, militaristic nationalism of mid-century in other parts of the continent, the ANAP and social liberalism Colombia, are examples of this trend which dominated the Latin American institutional life, both in the interwar period and during the 50 and 60 of the twentieth century.

Thus, the state emerged as a major operator—virtually alone—in the field of so-called public services. The same can be seen with its strong presence, at least in Latin America, the energy and hydrocarbon sector, which emerged across the continent powerful strategic state enterprises that took energy production, primarily from hydroelectric sources based on these international loans, usually after the Second World War, which were agreed with the multilateral banks and operated by large public companies.

The same phenomenon happened with a reduced role of multilateral funding in the hydrocarbons sector, given the enormous potential for rent-seeking in the process of production and management of such strategic assets. Public operators-state also played a definite role in the construction of physical infrastructure road, or road transport communications through networks of highways, or national coverage, transnational, even after the decade of the 30's of last century, in the emergency of port and airport systems. The increasing of an offer in other areas to promote goods and services was essential to the process of capital accumulation and construction of domestic markets and the foundations of industrialization schemes.

b. Taxation. In addition to promote development, plot fiscal reasons or a parallel tax system was crucial, given that large public companies configured from its high profitability and volume of operations, a strategic source of quasi-fiscal resources that went to the budgets of the central states and the local authorities in the regions and large cities. Considering the parallel tax arising from the operation of large state enterprises are instrumentalist scheme and populist welfare across the continent. Even in our times, we see this type of model in full swing (in Venezuela

under the guidance of Colonel Statist populist Chavez).

c. Subsidiary. The corporate state appeared as the last part to assure the social inclusion of those marginalized by the centripetal dynamic amplification specific to the commodification of public goods, destruction of autarky economies and peasant, the absorption of the craft and small-scale production under the processes of centralization and concentration of capital. Thus:

The second motivation is not in Latin America, the importance might be expected, it is the 'state pioneer', acting as a Schumpeterian entrepreneur, joined his field productive areas in the amount of capital required, low profitability, or other similar reasons, are not sufficiently attractive for private capital. State action, with such features, seems to be concentrated in the steel and heavy chemicals and is often linked to personal action of certain 'public entrepreneurs' charismatic (...) (Bo-neo, 1979, p. 78).

All this hand in hand with the formidable phenomenon of rapid urbanization in Latin America that meant virtually emptying the field, throwing thousands of former peasants - now uprooted - to the slums of big cities, forming a transition from a relatively marginal autarky and protected, characteristic of rural life, towards a scheme of absolute marginality and inability to self-sustenance, which was the main negative part in the process of urbanization in Latin American cities. Well, in this regard, the states promoted their large public companies try to ensure universal coverage or at the same time, by which I mentioned as "political price" is trying to establish the inclusion of most of the inhabitants in the consumption of essential goods, and further that the cooperation of the companies meet the demands of formal employment, amplifying the spectrum of administrative and bureaucratic state.

d. National interest or reason of state. Apart from the above items, it is significant to note that the emergence and consolidation of the corporate state has been seen, particularly in Latin America, for the ruling elites as a core compo-

ment of the strategy to strengthen the state in relation to their neighbors. Also, as rivals in the Westphalian framework of natural law - and, additionally, the ability to have the ruling elites of the nation-state of having a tight grip on society, controlling the business operation of its natural resources and property strategic public.

e. *Dynamic corporate autonomy.* Finally, when state enterprises were created either by the central government or sub national territorial entities, the patterns of behavior of top management of these public organizations, even in times of “statist welfare” for the first half of last century were governed to a large extent by focusing on managerial principles missionary purposes of production or operation of goods and services. In this regard, beyond the iron links of control claimed by territorial states, a leak of such business organizations in the state, to areas of decision and working autonomy. These tensions between subordination and autonomy are not only noticeable in state enterprises but also in other public life:

Rather than perceiving the central government as homogeneous, it seems appropriate to think of it as a set of interrelated organizations, in which the component organizations enjoy varying degrees - but significant - of autonomy. This implies the assumption that autonomy is not a feature of the so-called decentralized administration, but there are significant degrees of autonomy in the same central government agencies (Boneo, 1979, p. 94).

One of the most important arguments is the explanation of the business that continues to transform the state as its necessary role in the processes of capital accumulation. In particular as the inevitable partner in many business-type activities of the private sector. As one Mexican Cultural Affairs’ analyst says, this questions the growing process of the commodification of cultural goods:

Why do Entrepreneurial State? In some countries, states are implementing laws making access to public information just as they control the public and are intended to prevent corruption of various kinds: nepotism, cron-

yism, conflicts of interest, etc. However, in most western democratic states employers may also be eligible or appointed to public office. And while there are increasingly locks that prevent corruption, the truth is that an employer will not give your business ideas or is not required to dispose of their businesses or business partnerships. The state and the public domain which have limited objectives diametrically opposed to those of corporations as explained above and it is this open or veiled merger that poses serious dangers to the democratic state itself and the public domain. On the other hand, state power has been reduced. Has been redistributed, more closely connected to the needs and interests of corporations and less to the public interest (Muela, 2005, pp. 5-6).

With the arrival of industrial societies, companies had a privileged relationship with the state apparatus. This phenomenon allowed the working type known critic of Marxist theory. Remembering this thesis, I reminded the old dictum of Marx: “The capitalist state is the business committee of the Bourgeoisie.” The criticism of the alienation of the study was a step to disqualify political action on the part of business organizations. And in the political sphere came rebellious action by labor unions and employees.

The state eventually catalyzed these shocks in the form of a complex set of regulatory mechanisms. The Catholic Church itself influenced this dynamic (see labor encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII). Fordism would be the next step after *Laissez-faire* strengthens the ideology of the welfare state. Keynes and the New Deal would lead to social acceptance of this type of public contracts. And so on the basis of two models: the Rhine, corporate, and the liberal or English. At this stage, post-Fordist capitalism has removed the previous schemes of protection and regulation.

In the case of labor, it has gone to his contractual individualization. Deregulation has involved the liberalization of the organizational linkages of individuals while increasing flexibility and precariousness. In the United States, it is the remote origin of these changes. For neo-cor-

poratist perspective in the macro-level, meso-level and micro-level were called into question the established policy of industrializing type by the state (Chandler, 1962; Beck, 2000).

In North America, the protective role of the state has been less and the union achievements were in the margins of a benevolent attitude of the government. The texts of Chandler (1962) on this matter are highly demonstrative of American roads towards regulation, forms of association of public and private, a type of entrepreneurship policy, without intermediaries, amplifying the impact of the areas of business and industry. The political perspective becomes so dominated by the organizational vision in terms of open flows between individuals who calculate their own interests in terms of likely outcomes, the utility gain in the interactions. Thus, we understand the political perspective on the Strategic Management (Crozier, 1963; *et al.*).

On the other hand, in the European world, the social dynamics advanced in the direction anticipated by the analysis of Gramsci (1971). Especially in view of changes undergone by the political – economic equation. The emergence of civil society here would be the central phenomenon. The business community would not capture all non-state public life. In recent times, this emergency has been universalized to include in the agenda for study subjects such as corporate social responsibility (CSR), the relationships between environment and organizational life, the signal identification of wage relations, the changes experienced by the former bureaucratic and industrial organizations, and new channels of discourse type and the very processes of legitimation.

In short, the contradictions between the public spheres of civil society and business world are the main stages that mark the new lines of organizations as political actors. Before, the state was mostly, the process of public commercialized on a global scale. Thus, progress has been made towards new dynamic of market liberalization that breaks these monopolies and gives rise to a formidable process of private accumulation of capital in the context of globalizing dynamics.

Entrepreneurial state performance in the context of policy and market liberalization

At this point, it is crucial to investigate what has been the course of the numerous organizational changes, especially in the structure and function of public bureaucracies, which have led to change their patterns of action aiming to transform the management mechanisms and the professionalization. The ownership and management of organized power, designs in which concrete forms of compensation, control and performance evaluation and budget allocation patterns in companies that retain all or part of its public nature.

Despite the entrepreneurial state specificities in this new global age, we cannot forget some general considerations. In particular, that with globalization, the isomorphism in the operating practices of the organizations is increasingly rapid and widespread. If everything is standardized, the question that inevitably emerges is ... what are the differentiating factors between firms, and between areas of private and public? According to the dominant managerial discourse, the difference lies in the attributes that hold senior managers of business organizations. This would explain the differential use and advantages of roughly similar resources (people, technology, capital, market access, etc.) In order to get different results (leadership) also based on it is worth the huge salaries and benefits to the Upper management (Durán, 2005; Evans, 2002). Thus, the ability of the owner - including the state and its policyholders - i.e., exercising the sovereignty of property rights, much has been minimized and its relevance has been overtaken by the administrators.

The implementation of business policies and state

Majone and Wildavsky (1998) made a critical review of studies of implementation of public policies mentioned by the managers, trying to find the place and importance of such deals

during the implementation process. In other words, trying to understand how the implementation of a policy follows the original idea which was based on the design, or - if on the contrary - that original idea is transformed or “betrayed” by the implementers (emblematic operational leaders or senior managers), driven by the conditions of context, or the multiple interpretations that they make of the original idea, according to their own interests to set the policy objectives².

Here it is worth considering the pressure on the temporality exercised by the authorities (and the plaintiffs’ policies, but in reverse) to intervene in certain problems. The relevant question is whether this phenomenon of change and adaptation by managers is inevitable, and therefore we find it impossible to define a conceptual framework for the implementation process. The answer we give to these authors stressed the implementation is, above all, evolution in an uncertain world in which events occur over which they have a high degree of control and in which decisions are made under great uncertainty. As Simon told (1957), we cannot have all the information needed to decide what is best, but in practice, it is assumed to choose between the best and as far as the error.

This is, therefore, a critical approach to policy implementation called Top-Down (from top to bottom), under which there is usually a linear reasoning is, firstly, acceptance of a hierarchical order according to which makers are obeyed without regard for those performers who gradually are located at the base. Secondly, we introduce here a firm distinction between the political worlds in the interests of the world versus administrative neutrality. Thirdly, it assumes that, social actors operate under a rationale of

efficiency, why the perpetrators seeking to implement the instructions given by the decision maker as closely as possible.

The executing agency to be entrusted with a formal policy never acts alone but in cooperation or through other social actors (individuals, groups, institutions, etc.). Generally, the inter-organizational system is informal. Thus, to a large extent, the result of the implementation depends on the ability of its members to manage their interdependence, and the form of appropriation of the requirements, if not the public policy problems (Meny and Thoenig, 1992, p. 182).

As follows, the implementation of public policies is assumed in terms of a mobility function guided by the principle of circularity. This principle incorporates the preferences of states in public policy, as the interests of the various actors responsible for the design and implementation, taking into account their aspirations of power and negotiating skills. This perspective puts into question the privileged role of decision maker, since it is always questioned when the plan, program or project is handed over to the executors, who while responding to the imperatives of legal, organizational or consensual; they seek to do assert their own values and interests during implementation.

All these ideas in public business organizations are under the pragmatic perspective of NPM. In this direction, operational concepts emerge to identify the process tasks such as systems analysis methods, cost-benefit and cost-efficiency, multi criteria methods, cost accounting, management control, management by objectives, among others. This seems to be assured if the assumption is made the administrative submission to political power. From the above, the

² Every implementation inevitably involves transmutation. Since this happens in a world that we are never out of our perceptions, and concepts, often we find ourselves in the middle of the process, with events that have happened before and we hope to continue later. “In this way, the public policy theory is transformed to produce different results. Since we knew from experience what is feasible or preferable, correct the errors to the extent that these revisions to establish a difference to amend our original ideas of political action and outcomes (Majone and Wildavsky, 1998, p. 280). Good control means to prevent or decrease the distance between planning, design, and implementation. Only then will it be possible that the implementation of a policy corresponds to the original decision. This methodology seems to unite the formulation and implementation as a single stage. However, implementation is the result of negotiation between actors. From this perspective, the policies are reconfigured by the negotiation of interests between the various actors. So, what is denied is that the implementation process can be guided by the plan of action. Noting that the facts actually transcend the theory, Majone and Wildavsky make a review in the sense of establishing continuity between the fact to indicate a goal and a plan that incorporates, as this implies that the process contingency factors to emerge - noise or simply the emergence issues not covered - dramatically altering the original plan. In the words of Meny and Thoenig (1992), the perspective proposed by Majone and Wildavsky (1998) recognizes that the role of implementers is crucial.

question arises: To what extent is it possible to sustain such subordination of the administrative level at the political level over time? Surely this is a relationship not necessarily transparent and, on the contrary, it is clear that always keeps the administrative level autonomy, through which bureaucratic power will consolidate and expand its areas of control and decision.

Corporate governance as an imperative is to control the senior managers through mechanisms such as accountability, but in reality, it is based on the manager's own self. Anyway, it's hard not to submit information asymmetries. It has lost the boundary between the capital in terms of ownership and governance capacity. What is important is to have control over the organizations and societal resources (manage). In this perspective, the management in the field of the management role or senior management holds an enormous range of control over the strategic planning of organizations.

The administrative phenomenon was not thought of before because it was articulated closely with property rights. Today, the Theory of Principal-Agent takes the lead in the sciences of management, by the predominance taken by the Agent, with the specialized knowledge he possesses of the operation of enterprises. Thus, the administrator under the administrative direction -not operational- has gained control of large organizations.

The management - administrative function - has made a reality in large organizations confirms the phenomenon that those in the administration have supremacy over those who have property rights (e.g., Enron, Parmalat). This has led to the emergence of the theory indicated Corporate Governance and the reinvention of so-called CSR. These changes have undoubtedly a global dimension facing the role of the state enterprise throughout the world. In fact, there are:

(...) Public companies (state owned) that have become multinationals, which have subsidiaries in other countries and therefore have made direct investments abroad over a period of time prior to "generalization of the privatization phenomenon. In this context, we must remember that the laws may require that any

business owned by another state who wants to invest directly in a country has to receive prior expressed either in general or in relation to their size or sector of application. In this sense, private business, unconnected with the political nexus associated with the state-owned (public) may have more choices and lower costs of entry into foreign markets. Likewise, the privatized company can make direct investments abroad, as they take part or all other privatized companies or buying existing private companies or by new projects (Greenfield). Hence, the privatized firms become multinational companies, if they were in the process deepens. In this area would logically include those created joint ventures with foreign companies (Durán, 2005, pp. 221, 223).

This is not, however, an inescapable way. Undoubtedly, the huge extent of the phenomenon of multinational penetration of private capital and the partial withdrawal of the state enterprise in some of these dimensions of provision of goods and services is evidence of a transformation of public enterprises that survive resembling in many of its modes of operation to private companies and large corporations with competing and sometimes are associated (*partenariat public-privé*).

In the case of state and corporate governance, it recognizes the influence of so-called policy makers, or experts in policy making, whether in the field of health, education, agriculture, etc. Then created Think Tanks, or centers of strategic thinking, resulting, in that sense, strategic decisions are tied to the complexity of the object multivariate decision and this dimension alienates workers and grassroots officials and the average being concentrated in the elites of experts. This could be mitigated only if the organizations become an expert.

This explains the weakening of the role, responses and interactions with business and government, fueled by the union movement, to the transformation of public bureaucracy. Indeed, in reviewing many of the governance models of high-tech companies and conglomerates, whether public or private, you will notice that the strategic decision focused on groups of highly

specialized professionals. In many cases, these decisions inhibit a high share of non-experts. So today, in many areas, the level of structural transformation that is required in the management of services is not subject to public debate, because it only appears as a matter pertains to the competence of experts. In this way, democracy works only between equals because they are not equal - they are outside the knowledge or expertise - appear to be disqualified developers and decision makers.

Therefore, the new organizational reconfiguration tends to the complete professionalization of the organizations and top management that the dichotomy - be deleted based workers. This would be a first response to the kind of democratization posed by Luhmann (1995). The time comes to be an important factor because if someone makes a decision or deliberate himself doing a trial, there is certainly an estimate, but the actual decision in a person and the timing of the decision is relatively fast, but this decider can be wrong.

But if the decision is collective or collegiate debate tends to indefinitely extend processes becoming more complex timing factor to the maximum levels of debate. The paradox posed by Luhmann (op. cit.) Is how to combine democracy (not in its narrower sense) with the timing, implying that all members of the organization to participate in the deliberative process and decision-making or at least have less formal ways - as institutional arrangements - to allow the organization to discuss more or less continuous and permanent. In short, Luhmann suggests that the decision to expedite the dome can take that may have operational levels of discussion and in the midst of this is found as a privileged processing and mediation, specialized technical knowledge (middle bureaucrats).

The other route is the open debate of a political nature in which these issues are no longer 'own experts and those who can engage all citizens: take into account that all organizations of our times there are many technical choices inhibit the non-expert to participate and, on the other hand, there are policy decisions. For example, shareholders of the company make decisions on the level of dividends, based on financial reports that provide those responsibly. These are decisions of a political nature in which the actors involved - in this case, the shareholders - have the ability to discuss, in the same way as in politics in general citizens hold the power to decide their political choices, regardless of levels of training.

The full outsourcing scheme has a comprehensive matrix and lattice because if a company outsources the procurement, assembly, marketing, and even finance, is split operationally as opposed to the standard factory mass production. In addition, a panel of experts may have a relatively small staff and a large professional base, and there may be a greater level of democracy³. If robots computerize many processes, as the very basis of Taylorism, which are the direct workers, disappears, and organizations tend to become professional knowledge organizations. In such a way that the public organization transforms itself into a techno-structure of professional knowledge, v. gr. Planning an office or treasury composed of technicians and professionals, except some few who are in the collection boxes.

Territoriality, managerialism, and public policy

Is key, based on the above topics, determine the contexts and references in the operating companies of a governmental nature, in order to relate these changes to the tasks that meet the local authorities (departments and municipali-

³ This is what happens in the academic, as the rector of a university is not making the decision on a specific area, but the professors for tuition or who know the issue specifically. This is often seen in large universities, even regardless of whether they are public or private, under these organizations are ontologically low intensity in the answer, because any major decision takes a long process: a Committee of Department, then the Faculty Board, the Board, the Governing Council or the Central Board of Directors, etc. Through this process are constructed and concert many opinions on the grounds that any person has the capacity itself to make a decision and therefore the response of the organization tends to be slow. To the extent that the organization becomes an expert and she deleted the gap between decision-makers and implementers, setting up an organization to greater expertise, a phenomenon which Drucker (2004) has called "knowledge society."

ties). In this vein, it is worth reviewing the classical theories on the territorial jurisdiction of states. Public policies are privileged spaces for the exercise of state sovereignty in the context of the Westphalian principle of international relations. However, this line of demarcation tends to fade in our time, under the enormous force that has taken the policy intervention, including humanitarian variants, and also by the great weight in the current times of globalism have agencies and decision-making levels called “multilateral.”

Moreover, domestically, remain central studies on the relationship of power between central and regional levels subordinates, regions, towns, cities, region, etc. At this point, today, however, are “leaky” because under the model of city-region relationships and establishing bilateral and multi-directional flows between them, without taking into account as an essential reference to the central levels of the state apparatus. Mercantilism also in the provision of public goods generates dynamic public policies that affect traditional forms of inter-agency territories and central government level.

As a corollary of the previous trend centrifugal sub-regional or local control over land, it is worth emphasizing that this is not abstract or universal. There are - as they say in the contemporary strategic jargon - winners and losers since Capitalism is concentrated in large cities and their dynamics are highly asymmetric. Today, this is very clear in terms of the dynamics of city-region, a contemporary phenomenon of Capitalism is that large metropolitan areas within globalization become centripetal forces, large magnets to attract resources from all type and, of course, population.

In addition, other groups, influencing and regulating the market elites primarily professionals, business groups and conglomerates associated corporately. Professional associations are highly influential in the construction of policy and market regulation to control the supply and demand. Thus, they acquire a monopoly figure, input or output, and this can be seen very well on

the rules of the advanced capitalist societies are coming to us late.

In the golden age of centralized bureaucracies, the monopoly status and vertical configuration of the political and administrative management of public affairs made the problems of coordination in policy implementation and sustainability is not headquarters. The real axis is glimpsed in terms of organizational or administrative coordination that own institutional bureaucracies preset classical clearly defining roles and responsibilities unique and exclusive.

In contrast to these hegemonic periods, for a couple of decades, issues that have to do with policy coordination and subsidiarity are new issues that have emerged as vital in the process of implementation of public policy agendas. The problem of poor coordination between agencies and operators, from the dismantling of the welfare state and the transformation of post-Weberian bureaucracies, are vital and difficult to resolve based on a kind of governance, which might be called new managerial bureaucracy.

While the state today has continued to be an entrepreneur, what has changed is the nature of the business. What emerges is a new-managerial public bureaucracy, the state seeing himself as manager, administrator, and businessman in terms of liberalization and market opening. This does not, per se, the disappearance of a state as an operator in the implementation of public policies, but of course, it loses the monopolistic nature.

We moved from economies focused on the nation-state as a container for domestic markets to international markets. And I quote here: the market for property rights, i.e. who are the owners of companies. Looking at the SP sector, which has been going on since the 1990's to date is a huge process of purchasing, mergers and acquisitions by large global operators are not solely or even primarily U.S. companies.

In traditional public administration, bureaucracy meets standards and is structured around a central level, in ministries, departments, or even administratively decentralized units, which is

reproduced in the territories. Alternatively, the bureaucracy is bureaucracy managerial enterprise of contemporary capitalism. The nodal point of any analysis of the companies offering goods or services is whether they are public or private. However, state enterprises assume business logic privatizing action, regardless of the legal nature of such institutions or companies. In the previous model, the state subsidizes business and not captured large social income, so the public could feel the difference between public service agencies for business groups, versus the concession to private business. Absolutely, the debate on policy coordination is relevant in the context of a state that is no longer a monopoly in the provision of goods and services.

The main features of the new entrepreneurial organizations

The new entrepreneurial organization these days globalizing dominant strategic decisions through highly standardized processes and protocols, but sophisticated, and involves a higher level of professionalism, and specialization of financial decisions. For example, studies on such complex decisions in large corporations are outsourced, highly flexible management arrangements and operation, and even the government mega-projects are only viable with previous studies of investment banking.

Managerial techniques are used to benefit the overwhelming accumulation of capital and the exacerbation of consumption. The concentration of large corporations in the hands of a highly paid management and, therefore, blessed with these changes, he suggests a form of industrial bureaucracy - which in Weberian terms may be comparable to the government bureaucracy - share characteristics principles: hierarchy, professionalism and esprit de corps. Under this paradigm, companies are now seeking to achieve higher returns on capital, rather than the ability to produce. In this way, and as expressed by the French analyst De Gaulejac (2005):

As soon as the financial supply chain picks up the pace on the logic of production, relations of power at the center of the company will be changed [...] you change the personnel management and industrial relations for management human resources.

On the other hand, as to what the company is concerned, there are conditions that are currently discussed, showing that managerial activity is oriented towards the demand towards domestic capacity, as in the old model of capitalism mass production. It thus seeks to win customers⁴ and capture greater market share. In this sense, the image of corporations and financial corporations has become one of its main assets, which are believed to have significant value today is part of the profit potential they possess.

In fact, business owners understand that diversification is the best coverage that can be set in a world of uncertainty. Both the costs and benefits are available for this property are reflected in the price at which shares traded companies that are internalized by setting a value that reflects the funding source vendors and buyers, the cost is assumed to be able to obtain future benefits.

In operational terms, companies have discovered that the internal reinforcement is what ultimately produces benefits and positioning against the competition. Is the search for new productive beyond efficiency, so it is necessary to include human capital as a fundamental, as this is precisely the operational manager of the productive system of an enterprise, whatever name or ownership rights.

In this vein, the variability to be placed on companies, along with the playing conditions that in many cases are common to them, underscore the urgent need for capacity within the organization as a “living organism,” says and competes out, only if it strengthens internally. The current business dynamics shows that the response rate, coupled with the modern concept of service, leads to small, medium or large to develop in her womb environments and cultures based on hu-

⁴ De Gaulejac (2005) states that under the system of financial capitalism, the needs of customers become the main concern of companies, which take precedence over the products of the same, therefore, “the commercial and HR bow to the demands of financial management.”

man skills development and employment, which permeate the organization as a way of life, demonstrating outside them more competitive.

Control in entrepreneurial organizations

It should, as I have noted elsewhere (Varela, 2008, pp. 69 - 95), we glimpse here the matter of organized power in organizations embedded systems design such as globalization and environments in which new variables emerge and aspects that demarcate its complexity. It is essential in this order of ideas, emphasized that the representations (imaginary) of the underlying control individuals, in general, have the driver dichotomy - controlled environments such that they legitimized a "culture of control" through multiple regulatory requirements, both formal and informal.

The control, at present, has a traditional approach in many organizations and should be reoriented towards the aspects that demarcate the complexity of these systems. It is critical than the control approach that focuses on those issues that, from the naturalistic paradigm (Social Darwinism), have been beseeching the culture of organizations, such as the exercise of power, conservation of the bureaucracy and the preservation or enhancement hierarchies. The two key theses that will allow us to articulate the central idea already mentioned are:

a. Control tends to appear as the exercise of power in the light of contemporary managerial approaches.

b. Control effectiveness is the recognition of the complex reality of living systems.

In the first instance, we present a relationship between the concepts of power and control in general and, specifically, referring to the organized power and organizational control. Under this approach, control tends to become an agent handling controlled by another who plays the role of controller. However, this is just a preliminary sketch which is then complemented by an approach from the organizational referents.

The organized power can be understood as the human capacity to influence other (individual) or other (groups) to develop (n), for our influence, acts that are the jurisdiction of the holder of power. The organized power is exercised by the driver, while the controlled subject is the subject of organized power. The organizations are presented as scenarios for the exercise of power and connote as "political arena" (Varela, 2006, p. 35). The activities carried out in the exercise of the power generated tensions and in this sense. Appear as a booster control of such tensions. Following Pfeffer (2000, cited in Hatch, 1997, p. 39), politics in relation to power "involves those activities taken within the organization to acquire, develop and use power and other resources to achieve a preferred outcome in a situation in which there is uncertainty or disagreement about choices. " Thus, the organization under the imaginary scenario of power is configured in terms of the influence of a scenario in which coalitions converge (agreements) and collisions (conflicts) of interest.

The organization as a setting for power manifests itself also as a place of conflict in light of sociological theory, which is controlled by the exercise of power in attempts to mediate between the interests of the controlled (individual) and organizational interests (companies). Arguably, even the control and exercise of power seeks to minimize the current power of the worker and prevent it get more power based on knowledge or skills that give the company in exchange for payment. According to Aubert and De Gaulejac (1991, p. 35), "The power no longer belongs to a ruling class but to the fabric of the organization that controls the appearance of a new ruling class".

Control the setting for the exercise of power is inconsistent with the notion of control seen as the result of social interactions, in the light of the sociological view that sees the company as "a social fact, something produced by society" (Ibid., p. 33). Under this approach, the control is taking shape as a human activity that requi-

⁵ Bachrach and Baratz, (1970) have one side of the power of intentional or conscious, while other evidence that the exercise of power at an unconscious level. This conception of power can lead to assuming that power is synonymous with control, to address the conscious and unconscious aspects of hu-

res the ability to think, rather than the result of programming mechanistic issues related to the control takes place as an act of interaction and not mechanical or repetitive acts.

From this teleological approach of control refers to the faces that power is exercised based on the ideas of Bachrach and Baratz (1970)⁵, is abstracted one side of directness that leads to influence other (controlled) and an indirect nature by which barriers are created and reinforced values (social and political) to restrict others (Hatch, 1997, p.p 30 - 31). Control also transcends the borders of countries and connotes a process that transcends the boundaries of nations covering larger areas and in real time. Globalization, as a social process, transforms the organizational paradigms, the management and hence the control. Recall at this point in our analysis that globalization involves “an acceleration of the internal and external displacements of people, based on the technological conditions that have led to a very large mobility in space-time, facilitated by modern mass media, which have fed the territorial diaspora groups “(Varela, 2007, p. 33). To that extent, the control cannot be conceived or developed as an exercise of power, which would be supported in that despite having real-time information and communication networks, the controller would face the technological advances and collide with the culture of other geographic areas which could come in real time.

To avoid tripping and collisions, the driver will require concepts that take into account the virtual interactions or now lack of physicality (physical presence) and should be supported to control their own people have about themselves, the processes and actions developed. The concept of self-seems to be the paradigm can generate a break from designing the control and

exercise of power or recognition of human interactions, much like moving from mechanistic to systemic tradition.

Control, under the ideas of mass production and automation of Taylorism and Fordism, is related to saving time, “saving time, saving control are two key elements” (Coriat, 2000, p. 41). This approach allows us to foresee the need for greater influence in order to achieve the improvements that promise technological progress⁶. Control in the Post-Fordism takes complex forms and is exercised on the body, imagination and conscience. To control what happens to management, beyond the borders of the company, “beyond the field of impregnating the family business, culture, education, sports, media, etc.” (Aubert and De Gaulejac, 1991, p. 30).

But the effectiveness of control over the processes developed by humans pursues purposes beyond the optical micro and meso-level organizations, not only operates on the individual but on the organization, given the complex interactions between individual and organized system. For this reason, the system design is essential to understand the limitations of control and power and more consistent interpretations and discern the nature of organizations. Control effectiveness depends on adherence to the purposes for which it was created and organized this system and the organized power must recognize the complexity of relationships to ensure conditions of autopoiesis (Maturana, 1997, p. 28) or auto playback system (Luhmann, 1998, p. 106). This implies the possibility of choosing between alternatives of action, management, control, etc. What is control? This is an issue which the administrative literature assumes some answers: to maximize profitability, increase production, meet the strategic plans of the companies, etc. A

man beings. The development of control as the exercise of power transcends the boundaries of the human being as an employee and acquires access to the boundaries of his personal life or personal, hence the power is used to control even the most intimate areas of human's life.

⁶ According to Coriat (1996), control at this stage is one of four basic components that guide the conceptualization of a “robot” (along with those of engine, transmission and operation), from which it follows that the control and power would ideal claim which would achieve a maximum influence on the subject controlled (machine, robot or robot) in development processes. Under this aspect, the control and exercise of power, leave the boundaries of the social sciences and find adequate shelter in engineering, the concept of automatic control systems would be ideal in terms of theory and practice of control. To develop the control and exercise of power can be referenced in the notorious problem asks how to make the human being to lose power in organizations to which the organization has control over it? Then all devices and control dynamics in organizations revolve around reducing the power of individual action, either in administrative or operational.

general conception could revolve around the fact that the purposes of control are aimed at achieving the objectives of an organization, which would mean not only to maximize profits, but also manage the confluence of a number of interests and needs in within an organization conceived as a system of complex relationships.

Upon the imaginary conflict, control is impacting the representations of control. From this viewpoint, the control can be interpreted in different ways and be exercised in their activities, in light of the interpretations that make it, which indicates that exercise control and effectiveness depends on the imaginary in relation to the culture of organizations have been consolidated. Then the control can be approached from two trends which would delimit knowledge within an organization. The first conceive it as an exercise of power, in which case, its effectiveness would be on the management skills to influence others, the second trend demarcates a new path and, under his protection, control is seen as recognition of the complex organizational systems, in which case its effectiveness would be on the communicative capacity of the various elements of the organizational system.

It is necessary to consider other imagery of control, since control, like power, seems related to the design of a controller in the center and some control in the periphery. This change in attitude controller, which recognizes social interactions will thrive under the consideration that "is causing a shift in the power predictor of social images in a world that has become more open and no longer can be understood according to the schematic model of center and periphery" (Beck, 2002, p. 104). For this reason, a new paradigm of control, one possibility is a necessity.

Control should be transformed as society relations are transformed. In the words of Aubert and De Gaulejac (1991, p. 32), the man was banished from its center and modern technologies make up a complex network of networks and systems on which human organizations. According to Luhmann (1998), "organizational systems are social systems composed of deci-

sion-making and mutually binding themselves." For this reason, the idea of complexity emerges in the interpretations, representations and theoretical analysis - organizational. The control is configured as something more complex than the exercise of power in an organization, because if the organization is a social system in which humans interact in a universe of decisions, they must mediate choice, not only actions of influence. If an organization does not give scope for action, it would deny its nature as a system composed of decisions.

But leave the optical power control as required to take different paths to the paths for financial or patrimonial capitalism as the activity, process or control person to be disconnected from the places where decisions are made. According to De Gaulejac (2005, p. 4), "this transformation of capitalism favors a general process of deterioration of power." Then give up the traditional control and exercise of power in the context of speculative capitalism. The current optical control and governance, involving a speech ambiguity in organizations, because it speaks of belonging and values such as employee loyalty (read: controlled), on the one hand, and manipulates the human being to do what that the driver you want, or be "trained" to expire stress, is a winner or a more human, and treated like a machine that is handled as if he was doing maintenance.

Relational power analysis systems models

The control should consider the social nature of man and the processes it develops. No man is an extension of the machine or an extension of the wishes of the organization, the human being is the essential element of the interactions in the organized system. Western thought raises over as the exercise of influence on the controlled controller, i.e., as an individual subject to the management doing the things you want the driver, i.e. the individual who fits the company time and not vice versa, which does not allow a minimum of differentiation of men with respect to the machine. Recall as:

From now on, is a state of mind which is manifested in behavior, is a commitment to the goals that can address unforeseen, it is then on these representations to be keeping track (...) each individual becomes relay control exercised over the ways of being and thinking, a control that is part of intersubjective communication, relationships between the individuals responsible (Jordá, 1999, p. 35).

In organizational theory exists today a very strong field for the study of so-called inter-organizational power, which is usually seen in the relational sense of power systems. In a market society, organizations that are contingent, competing among them. Social Darwinism organizational interprets the political arena as an area of ongoing conflict and competition in which there is a risk of disappearing. This response to conatus (human beings need to persevere in their being). What exists is to preserve its existence, which resulted in the twentieth century in the theory of entropy.

The mega-contemporary organizations must make a strong effort to hold because if not, tend to disappear, which means a complex investment in the relationship ends - because the media makes conatus diversion goals and the organization becomes an end in itself. Then, the organizations seek to accomplish its aims but partially, because otherwise, they lose their *raison d'être*. The organizations preserve their own being, and transformed the relationship ends. We affirm, therefore, that the effectiveness of control in organizations is more a matter of creating alternatives to decide on areas of communication between human beings, rather than a simple matter of giving orders and verify their compliance, i.e. control is more an opportunity to act on the complexity of the organization through decision-making and communication, an opportunity to verify that it has had power over an individual.

The new types of entrepreneurial organizations under the new form of capitalism of the late twentieth century and how far this century, in which the management is closely linked and dependent on the success of marketing. It is clear that we have entered a new stage of capitalism

characterized by flexible, link marketing, segmentation and performance of organizations in competitive environments of a global market, although not ruling out significant areas of local and regional marketing and the intertwining of networks and grids of capitalism in the financing, production, logistics, and media.

It is worth emphasizing here that organizations embody institutions. There is a very strong double relationship between organizations and institutions, as in the fact that the first responding to the needs of institutions. At the same time, organizations use the institutions to perpetuate themselves. Institutional change is very slow, while organizations are changing rapidly, hence it is claimed that all organizations are contingent. While there have been many changes in the landscape of capitalism, it is premature to declare the demise of classical modes. Therefore, it is worth noting that Taylorism and Fordism have not disappeared, and that remains its central axis, the separation between the worker and the work of highly skilled labor, i.e. between decision-makers and those who run them. What exists is a myth when it comes to his death. However, what if they can say is that there is a loss of autonomy for the managers because the capacity of information technologies, cannot reach ex-post reports or orders - months later - but arriving in real time. Similarly, senior officers and all those involved in the organization have to act according to standards, standardized protocols. Even the Top Managers have lost autonomy in decision-making.

Taylorism has been merged with the difference that an increasing number of people in each position in the organization have some degree of expertise, in contrast to previous Taylorism in which the workers did not know anything beyond their work operational. Through certifications and no updates can be linked in some work activity without some level of expertise. Examples are the cooks and caretakers. The capital today is a knowledge capital; in which people are linked to business activities have some degree of expertise. This means expert knowledge and

Table 1. Main features of the modes of organization of production and work (ss. XIX-XXI)

Taylorism - Fordism	Post- Fordism or Toyotism
Uniform mass market	Segmented Markets
Plant assembly line set	Flexible assembly plant. Relocation of production
Machining: Machine/Tool	Robotics, artificial intelligence
Division and specialization of labor	Utility Worker
Mass production predominates	Flexible production
	Dominated by finance / marketing

Source: Authors

ability to articulate an organization and their teams. Today, intellectual property, focusing on knowledge, is based on certifications. The intellectual capital of those seeking access to an organization is measured and supported in products such as diplomas, certifications, publications and records, the performance is seconding this when competition is relatively equitable.

Companies in the last century were not as recognized as today, they have the lead in society determined or governed by the forces of intellectual capital. For example, the Consulting Groups and companies selling products packaged knowledge as video games, software, and scripts. In these organizations, knowledge becomes the commodity for the exclusive use of those who legally bought and is regulated by the law of property. The same happens with scientific knowledge. In this way, intellectual property and property rights are the centers of capital accumulation. Productive organizations are undergoing a transformation as a result of the changes that have been emerging in society. This new company, compared to the Taylorism/Fordism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, has characteristics that profoundly impact social dynamics and logic of organizational behavior.

The new companies (Post-Fordism or Toyota) that are listed in Table 1, have been named in many ways, depending on the theoretical perspective with which you are approached, whether political, economic or social. The name of post-industrial society corresponds to an economic perspective, the post-modern society, and a social and cultural and post-capitalist politics. Among the authors who exemplify this broad

theoretical portfolio of the new company is Drucker (2004) when he says that pension funds are major shareholders in financial capitalism or society "Post-capitalist." Similarly, critical philosophers like Deleuze and Guattari (1980), Lyotard (1979), Baudrillard (1993) and Beck (2002) speak of "Post-modernity" as a cultural phenomenon, while other theorists such as Castells (2002), Giddens (1994) and Habermas (1989) discuss about an extended or a modern continuation of modernity.

The dominance of finance and marketing is perhaps the most obvious feature and the main factor of change in the new society. Finances back to a sense of the ephemeral and speculative and, therefore, uncertainty and the short term, and secondly, the importance of the commercial and sales. We face a world of objects and services in which everything is commodified. Property rights have mutated to situations in which it is the knowledge that has value and not the object or service per se.

The evolution of management, with the passage of craft production to mass production, it certainly was a momentous change for the time. However, the new demands of markets show that the large volumes of production, are an obstacle to obtaining benefit by companies, that because the customers demand differentiation, which requires increasing levels of flexible production systems in order to make customized products, which in principle under the paradigms of the costs, it was unenforceable under favorable economic conditions.

This raises the mandatory need to link the managerial strategy with the strategy of business

operations. Meanwhile, in the daily management of the business has forced managers to take positions resulting from a search of methods, models or theories that will achieve a competitive advantage differentiator that is more important than ever before in the business world.

The new marketing has two essential characteristics: differentiation: on the range, size, design or model, to customize the consumption and the ephemeral nature of goods and services, materials made from flexible nature of short duration. Segmentation, derived from the differentiation is pretty well built. The dominant trend today is to create and have products and services for different sectors of the global population to ensure full coverage of potential consumers and increase sales and revenue production organizations.

When asked about the place of production and the plant you are talking about a kind of transfer to the industrial era that characterized the nineteenth century and half of the twentieth century, which could be called “wage society.” This company pay was based on two axes: the industrialization and mass production, by linking private and public service labor. This led to a state employer’s large population and a large formal employment growth, typical of mass industrialization. There was also the growth of mass consumption, concomitant with industrialization⁷.

In the wage society, people are measured by their income and charges. In the post-pay, people are measured by consumption. Marcuse (1972) coined the term consumer society that alienates human beings because it makes the company the credit only for the consumer also determines the lifestyle. In this vein, the lessons are now reshaping consumer classes and self-representation of the consumption today (Marketing), which was previously determined by the place it occu-

pied in the production. The main cause of the significant reduction in industrial employment is the effect of computerization and robotics in production processes, thanks to the continued expansion and deeper automation. Now you can see, for example, ports with a quarter of the staff that worked on them before, thanks to the introduction of automatic cranes, sensors and bands, or see the case of tolls in the U.S., they do not need someone taking payments.

This paradox suggests that there is a society that encourages consumption but at the same time, reduce the consumption capacity of certain segments of society (lower classes). So if employment falls and revenue fell, who consume? For this there is a surprising answer is talk about the limits consumption has reached a new society: they must not forget that a segment of the population amplifies the consumption thanks to high level of expenditure. In addition, consumption has soared well because our companies are practicing perpetual indebtedness.

Conclusions

It is about recognizing how the logic of contemporary management has broken the differentiation between public and private. Today, for managers and policy makers there is no per se public management in a strict sense of the word, but the New Public Management, as an extension of the principles of private management of public administration. This went hand in hand with the commodification of the public. This has been the big trend that has transformed everything in the field of territorial states actions, and involves a substantial transformation under the public now has been commercialized so radical and absolute, whereas before there were large and significant areas non-commercialization, alongside other traditional areas of commercialization own private enterprise, and finally some areas of

⁷ In 1950 and 1960, presents the point of cap or crown of the wage society: a society of full employment in which the bulk of people live on a salary, with guaranteed job protection, social insurance, stability and formalization, and with a high degree of unionization. In Latin America was in Mexico (thanks to the PRI), Argentina (in the era of post-Perón and Peronism), and on a smaller scale, in Brazil. In the rest of Latin America and the world, this phenomenon occurred in enclaves. Using a relativization with the current situation, we may be talking about a “post-wage society, and that fewer people have that model of strong wage, job security and formal contracts. Before privatization, the state is no longer the major employer and there is a commodification of the public and transformation of labor law.

commercialization regulated. Hence, even though the company is now precarious wage is consumed by these pathways in the sectors of society with higher incomes and greater consumer power consumer that intensify their activities to unimaginable levels. At the same time, society does not disappear completely because salaries and wages are precarious, still, exist, because the salary disappears in certain areas of formal employment and gradually fades the epitome solid, secure and stable model of society pay.

With the flexibility of work, insecurity related to unemployment and structural unemployment increases. And, of course, political reforms – the administrative state in the world order, imply a substantial decline of the protective function of the state is in danger of collapsing or substantially reduced. Thus, the identification becomes individualism and personalities crisis, involving a social triggered global phenomena such as suicide, alcoholism, drug addiction, or in a much more lax, the marginalization and withdrawal options are self-leveling of individuals and groups in the current context of globalization.

Contemporary societies involve two main areas that interact symbiotically: the regulated market and the planned allocation of resources and political via the State. Economic accumulation explains how many of the great business tycoons have become rich, not the market but by politics. On numerous occasions, decide how rich a person is not the market, but the state. With simple entry and exit regulations are decided contractual allocations of resources giant, concessions and privileges to private or state enterprises themselves. And, as we shall see below, the cornerstone of these processes is how regional political actors define the public agenda in concert with this motley universe union and corporate.

Hence, the policy coordination problems emerge when there is the transition from welfare capitalism focused on the nation-state which monopolized the implementation of policies by way of highly centralized bureaucracies toward a model of companies which, although they re-

main national systems have become open in the context of globalization or globalism, in which public bureaucracies have become non-managerial and administrative bureaucracies.

Despite its considerable power, the state still significant part of their bureaucracies and the political class, i.e. the whole set of his paintings and paid officials, is above all an instrument in the hands of economic and societal powers, rooted in the long-term institution-building process. The public-private partnerships in this way express the dominant forms of cooperation between the state, as the administrative apparatus, and logic of business and private interests, particularly under the rule of commodification in most areas of both public and private life.

References

- Aubert, N., y De Gaulejac, V. (1991). *El coste de la excelencia. ¿Del caos a la lógica o de la lógica al caos?* Barcelona, España: Ediciones Paidós Ibérica.
- Bachrach, P., y Baratz, M. (1970). *Power and poverty: theory and practice*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (1993). *La transparencia del mal*. Barcelona, España: Editorial Anagrama.
- Beck, U. (2000). *Un nuevo mundo feliz. La precariedad del trabajo en la era de la globalización*. Barcelona, España: Paidós.
- Beck, U. (2002). *Pouvoir et Contre – Pouvoir à l'ère de la Mondialisation*. Paris, Francia: Flammarion.
- Boltansky, L., & Chiapello, E. (1999). *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme*. Paris, Francia: Gallimard.
- Boneo, H. (1979). *Las empresas estatales en América Latina*. Caracas, Venezuela: CLAD – Editorial Arte.
- Castells, M. (2002). *La era de la información (vol. 1): La sociedad red*. México: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Coriat, B. (1996). *El taller y el robot*. México: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Coriat, B. (2000). *El taller y el cronómetro*. México: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Crozier, M. (1963). *Le phénomène bureaucratique*. Paris, Francia: Editions du Seuil.
- Chandler, A. D. Jr. (1962). *Strategy and Structure – Chapters in the history of the american industrial enterprise*. Cambridge, UK: The MIT Press.
- De Gaulejac, V. (2005). *La société malade de la gestion – Idéologie managériale et harcèlement social*. Paris, Francia: Seuil.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1980). *Capitalisme et Schizophrénie. Mille plateaux*. Paris, Francia: Les Editions de Minuit.
- Down, A. (1967). *Inside Bureaucracy*. Boston, USA: Little, Brown and Co.
- Drucker, P. (2004). *La sociedad postcapitalista*. Bogotá, Colombia: Editorial Norma.
- Dunsire, A. (1978). *Control in a Bureaucracy*. New York, USA: St. Martin Press.

- Durán H., J. J. (2005). *La empresa multinacional – Gobernanza y responsabilidad social*. Madrid, España: Cámara de Madrid.
- Evans, P. (2002). *Hybridity as an administrative strategy: combining bureaucratic capacity with market signals and deliberative democracy*. VII Congreso del CLAD sobre la Reforma del Estado y la Administración Pública. Lisboa, Portugal.
- Giddens, A. (1994). *Les conséquences de la modernité*. Paris, Francia: L'Harmattan.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Notas sobre Maquiavelo, la política y el Estado moderno*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Juan Pablos Editores.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *El discurso filosófico de la modernidad: doce lecciones*. Madrid, España: Taurus.
- Hatch, M. J. (1997). *Organization theory – Modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Jordá, H. (1999). *Travail et discipline. De la manufacture à l'entreprise intelligente*. París, Francia: L'Harmattan.
- Luhmann, N. (1995). *Poder*. Barcelona, España: Anthropos Editorial del Hombre, Universidad Iberoamericana.
- Luhmann, N. (1998). *La teoría de la sociedad*. México: Triana editores, Universidad Iberoamericana.
- Liotard, J. F. (1979). *La condition postmoderne*. Paris, Francia: Les Editions de Minuit.
- Majone, G., y Wyldavsky, A. (1998). La implementación como evolución. En: *Implementación – Cómo grandes expectativas concebidas en Washington se frustran en Oakland*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica y Colegio Nacional de Ciencias Políticas y Administración Pública, A.C.
- Marcuse, H. (1972). *El hombre unidimensional: ensayo sobre la ideología de la sociedad industrial avanzada*. Barcelona, España: Seix Barral.
- Maturana, H. (1997). *De Máquinas y Seres Vivos, autopoiesis de la organización de lo vivo*. Santiago de Chile, Chile: Editorial Universitaria.
- Meny, I., y Thoenig, J. C. (1992). *Las políticas públicas*. Barcelona, España: Editorial Ariel.
- Muela M, Z. (2005). La era del Estado empresarial versus el dominio público informacional y cognitivo. *Revista Razón y Palabra*, (44).
- Negri, T., y Hardt, M. (2002). *Imperio*. España: Paidós.
- Olsen P., J. (2004). *Maybe it is time to rediscover bureaucracy*. IX Congreso del CLAD sobre la reforma del Estado y la Administración Pública, Madrid, España.
- Simon, H. (1957). *Administrative behavior – A study of decision making processes in administrative organization* (2ª ed.). Estados Unidos: Macmillan Publishers.
- Stiglitz, J. (2002). Mejorando la eficiencia y la capacidad de respuesta del sector público: lecciones de la experiencia reciente. *Reforma y Democracia*, (22), 7–68.
- Varela B., E. (2005). *Desafíos del interés público – Identidades y diferencias entre lo público y lo privado* (2ª ed.). Santiago de Cali, Colombia: Programa Editorial, Universidad del Valle.
- Varela B., E. (2006). Visiones Manageriales sobre el funcionario público – La teoría de la burocracia revisitada. *Serie Pliegos Administrativos y Financieros*, (41).
- Varela B., E. (2007). *Las transformaciones de la burocracia pública en Colombia – Los impactos de la política neoliberal en el sector de los servicios públicos domiciliarios*. (Tesis doctoral). Universidad de Montreal, Canadá.
- Varela B., E. (2008). Instituciones y poder organizado – Una mirada crítica sobre la conexión de las teorías administrativas con la perspectiva política. En: *Burocratización y modos de gestión en los servicios públicos* (pp. 69-95). Bogotá, Colombia: ECOE Ediciones, Universidad del Valle, Universidad Libre-Seccional Cali.