

ALBERTO GUERREIRO RAMOS: THE “IN-BETWEENER” AS INTELLECTUAL BRIDGE BUILDER?

Curtis Ventriss*
Gaylord George Candler**
José Francisco Salm***

Abstract

At the end of a long career Alberto Guerreiro Ramos sought a reconceptualization of the science of organizations that recognized non-economic dimensions of human associated life. His efforts fell short, and we will argue that this was because his influence outside Brazil has been fairly minor. This is not, however, due to any intellectual failure on his part rather, in the North America where Alberto Guerreiro Ramos did what he thought was his most important work, the intellectual milieu was both paradigmatically narrow and culturally insular.

Keywords: Alberto Guerreiro Ramos. Social systems delimitation. Global epistemology. Organization science. Para-economic paradigm.

Alberto Guerreiro Ramos: o mediador de uma reconstrução intelectual?

Resumo

Após o final de uma longa carreira, Alberto Guerreiro Ramos procurou reconceituar a ciência das organizações, para que ela reconhecesse as dimensões não econômicas da vida humana associada. Seu esforço repercutiu pouco, como se argumenta neste artigo, porque a sua influência fora do Brasil foi razoavelmente menor. Contudo, este fato não ocorreu devido a uma carência intelectual de sua parte. Ao contrário, na América do Norte, onde Alberto Guerreiro Ramos realizou o que ele pensou ser o seu mais importante trabalho, o meio intelectual era, ao mesmo tempo, limitado em termos paradigmáticos e culturalmente insular.

Palavras-chave: Alberto Guerreiro Ramos. Delimitação dos sistemas sociais. Epistemologia global. Ciência da organização. Paradigma paraeconômico.

**Doutor pela University of Southern California – USA. Professor da Rubinstein School of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Vermont e Adjunto da Johns Hopkins University. Endereço: 365 Aiken Center. University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405-0088. E-mail: clventriss@msn.com*

***Doutor pela Indiana University. Professor Associado da University of North Florida. E-mail: g.candler@unf.edu*

****Ph.D. pela University of Southern California – USA. Professor Visitante do Núcleo de Pós-Graduação da Escola de Administração da Universidade Federal da Bahia – NPGA/EAUFBA. E-mail: jfsalm@uol.com.br*

The first step to understanding of men is the bringing to consciousness of the model or models that dominate and penetrate their thought and action. Like all attempts to make men aware of the categories in which they think, it is difficult and sometimes painful activity likely to produce deeply disquieting results.

Isaiah Berlin

Introduction

In the introduction to a 2006 symposium on the work of Alberto Guerreiro Ramos, two of us (Ventriss and Candler) offered three reasons why Ramos's work remains relevant. The second of these was

...as a self-described "in-between" his work is an intellectual bridge builder. As a poor Afro-Brazilian educated in the European (especially French) intellectual tradition, early attracted to the empiricism of the Chicago School of American sociology, and who was subsequently to spend the last fifteen years of his professional career in the US, Guerreiro Ramos bridged a wide range of both geographical and intellectual worlds that contemporary social science still struggles to integrate. (CANDLER; VENTRISS, 2006, p. 495-6)

We would like to focus our remarks in this essay on the 'struggle to integrate' or, in terms of the metaphor used in the title of this paper, to 'build bridges' between the 'geographical and intellectual worlds' that contributed to the development of the unusual scholar who is the focus of this Symposium. As suggested in this earlier discussion, we argued then, and further research since has provided more evidence, that global scholarship in the social sciences too often reflects not so much a single body of scholars developing knowledge for humanity, as it does a collection of national bodies of scholars developing knowledge for their own societies.

We will develop the discussion in three broad sections. Despite this loose structuring of our argument around the global reach of Alberto Guerreiro Ramos's scholarship, the first, largest section of this chapter will discuss the major themes of his work that have had the most influence and/or the most relevance outside Brazil. Having gone into exile in 1966, he ended up at the faculty of the University of Southern California in the United States. Ramos therefore spent the last fifteen years of his career teaching and writing outside Brazil. He also published what he saw as his most important work, indeed a first installment of the culmination of his life's work, in North America, so the question of his international influence is certainly relevant.

The second theme we will develop concerns Ramos's own work that had a strong international focus, especially his series of works in the 1950s and 1960s on international development. Here he both challenged the dominant, Euro-centric thinking on development strategy, while also contributed to the development of a Brazilian approach to the process.

Finally, we will argue that this extraordinary, unusually global scholar remains a marginal figure in global scholarship. This is not due to the lack of relevance of his work but to the epistemic parochialism at the center of global academic discourse.

Guerreiro Ramos' Global Scholarship

These words convey an almost eerie skeletal plainness which explains a haunting and rather cryptic process that can disguise – or at least obscure – what Ramos (1981a, p. 4) so delicately referred to as "a normative dimension of established power configuration". Not surprisingly, Berlin's words are echoed in Ramos's sober attempt to elucidate the salience of his notions of cognitive politics, para-economy, and the behavioral syndrome. In addressing these different (but

related) concepts, he poses a rather quotidian question: how do we address (and make sense) of the ubiquitous influences of the market that can distort our language and mold our thinking processes in how we interpret social, political, and economic reality? Ramos was certainly not the first thinker to raise such a question, but he stands unique as a social scientist in public administration and public policy drawing our attention to the Heraclitean moving current of a particular historical phenomenon that has essentially muted the normative ability to seriously confront plausible alternatives to such a pervasive mind-set. This is why, to some extent, there is an acerbic theoretical edge to his analysis that points to the need of developing different frameworks (or models), and to more fully understand these models of thought that run so rampantly through our political veins. In essence, what concerned Ramos is the underlying psychology of the market-centered society, whereby, as a natural extension of such a mentality, we need to start viewing organizations as cognitive systems and how organizational members internalize the instrumental values of these cognitive systems thus becoming merely a "behaving creature" devoid of any capacity for action.

While Ramos was trying to analyze the conceptual gravity of this trend on modern thought, he was equally solicitous about how "exchange value, not value in use, constitutes the goal of a modern society" (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 33). In the next breath, he put it in even blunter terms. Modern society's "main concern [has become] material prosperity rather than the goodness of human association" (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 33). Here Ramos proposes his polemic para-economy paradigm that can resist the truculent trends of a market-centered society with one that is multidimensional in nature.

We will discuss each of these different approaches (cognitive politics, behavioral syndrome, and para-economy) in turn and argue that although he is often viewed as writing in elegiac tones concerning instrumental rationality, and, at the same time, tending to exaggerate the premodern conditions of human existence, nevertheless his salient contributions to the issues facing modern society are insightful because he assiduously focuses attention on the "substantive loss" of maintaining a distortive human associated life and how it will – taken to its extreme – extirpate any understanding of "the historical varieties of the human predicament" (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 43). That in itself is worthy of note.

Cognitive politics. Pulling no theoretical punches, Ramos in a rather orotund style of expression outlined the following deleterious implications of cognitive politics:

...Organizations currently typical of the market system are of necessity phony and deceitful. They are bounded to deceive both their members and clients, inducing them on micro-level not only to accept their output as desirable, but also, on the macro-level to believe that they exist and function in the vital interest of society at large. Organizations today have an unprecedented and active role in the individual's socialization process. They attempt to become the society. And they would seem to have the ability to do so because they are powerful epistemological systems in themselves and are presently unrestricted in influencing citizens through the exercise of cognitive politics. (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 80-81)

Saying this, Ramos asserts that cognitive politics is in effect the "psychological coin" of the market-centered society. Yet, he avers at the same time that cognitive politics must be understood as a perennial historical phenomenon. What is different from previous historical eras is that it is now totally captive, and reflective of the parochial cognitive patterns that exalt the instrumental values of efficiency and expediency in every aspect of social and political affairs. He is particularly insightful, we believe, in how he contends that social scientists have separated "politics" from "cognition" – a lacuna that has led sociologists, economists, and political scientists to ignore how widespread cognitive politics has become in the larger social fabric. This recalcitrant proclivity has basically left the social thinker, for the most part, unable to carefully – from both a normative and empirically perspective – explore "the conscious or unconscious use of distorted language, the intent of which is to induce people to interpret reality in terms that reward the direct and/or indirect agents of such distortion" (RAMOS, 1981a, p.76). This is somewhat

reminiscent of Sheldon Wolin's (1994) postulation that this process inevitably leads to the domestication of politics itself. But Ramos raises a salient point that has been overlooked by most scholars: the separation of politics and cognition (much like the separation of politics and administration) is not only intellectually factitious, it has come at a disconcerting theoretical price. Why is it, he laments, that such highly praised scholarship as displayed in Parsons (1964), Deutsch (1960), and Rostow (1960), (just to name a few) have rarely been criticized by many mainstream scholars for the hegemonic market-centered assumptions that are primarily filled with normative overtones? Moreover, cognitive politics, Ramos declares, exerts prodigious power and influence mainly because it is often hidden under a thick fog of news media and advertising. It is worth quoting Ramos at length:

Today the market tends to become the shaping force of society at large, and the peculiar type of organization which meets its requirements has assumed the character of a paradigm for organizing human existence at large. In such circumstances the market pattern of thinking and language tend to become equivalent to patterns of thinking and language at large; this is the environment of cognitive politics. Established organizational scholarship is uncritical or unaware of these circumstances, and thus is itself a manifestation of the success of cognitive politics. (RAMOS, 1981a, p.81)

The intellectual symmetry of Ramos's main contention here is that social scientists run the risk of becoming part and parcel of cognitive politics, and, in so doing, become the intellectual carrier of the illegitimate internalization of instrumental and materialistic values as the overarching criteria for ordering political affairs, or what he termed the behavioral syndrome.

The behavioral syndrome. One of the most important contributions that Ramos has made is his notion of the behavioral syndrome (PAULA, 2007, p. 179-80). Here he borrows heavily from Hannah Arendt's (1958) distinction between behavior and action. Briefly stated, the meaning of behavior, which she traced back to 1490, refers to conformity, habit, and commands mandated by external forces. According to Ramos, behavior is primarily a utilitarian reckoning of consequences commensurate to a kind of conduct dictated by external imperatives (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 45). Action, on the other hand, is non-utilitarian and one "who deliberates about things because he is conscious of their intrinsic ends" (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 45). In recognition of such intrinsic ends, action is an ethical mode of conduct. Ramos pushes this Arendtian analysis to contend that when properly understood the behavioral syndrome "is a socially conditioned mood affecting individuals' lives when they confuse the rules and norms of operations peculiar to episodic social systems with rules and norms of their conduct at large" (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 46). This somewhat awkward phrasing is an attempt to draw our attention to how serial categories of thinking, as displayed in historicism, has legitimized the modern market era as intrinsically, both substantially and functionally, superior to any other historical period. Ramos directly challenges us to rethink whether this peculiar episodic condition of human existence, with the market assumptions so embedded in it, is not equated with human nature at large. With a worrisome tone to his words, he contends that we now live in a society in which human associated life is nothing more than an interplay of individual interests – "a society in which sheer calculus of consequences substitutes for man's commonsense" (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 46). He reiterates that we have assumed fallaciously that the "behaving creature" of socialization and acculturation represents in itself a strong normative foundation for modern society. He draws an acumen conclusion, given this state of affairs, that has been overlooked by critics and admirers alike:

The good man in turn is never a completely socialized being; rather he is an actor under tension, yielding to, or resisting social stimuli on the grounds of his ethical sense. Actually a society can never approach 'goodness' because of the unregulated processes of the market. (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 46)

There is nothing necessarily furtive about what he is trying to contend, particularly in regards to his discussion of what he calls the "fluidity of self" (a fluid

calculative creature who behaves uncritically to the rules of expedience), "perspectivism" (to behave well the individual takes others' viewpoint as the ingredient for proper human conduct), "formalism" (an adherence to mannerisms divorced from any consideration of ethical ends), and "operationalism" (an emphasis on methodological proceduralism whereby knowledge itself is held valid as long as it reinforces a mathematical verification of knowledge). Hovering in the background is the intellectual shadow of Hobbes who, according to Ramos, was instrumental in providing the psychological requisites necessary for a market society. In fact, Hobbesian assumptions serve as an ideological framework that "the [individual] never acts properly, but always yields to external inducements..." (RAMOS, 1981a, p.59). Such a reality, Ramos conjectures, ultimately results in a moral paralysis and ethical degeneration that can easily allow us to drift into political quietism, and, even more dangerously, into a state of affairs where political action and political manipulation lose all substantive distinction. It is as if we have become so intoxicated by cognitive politics – and the behavioral syndrome of which it is a part – that we are left with instrumental values as our sole ethical barometer. This normative hypnotic propensity inevitably masks the language of power – a language consumed by tautology, empty clichés, and pseudoscientific utilitarian assumptions about the nature of the individual. To summarize: rather than reacting wholly to market incentives to achieve instrumental ends, Ramos sought to emphasize as well the importance of substantive action to achieve normative ends. Given the validity of these assertions, Ramos posits a more fundamental question that continues to haunt us: assuming the validity of his claims, how can one escape from this intellectual mystification?

The para-economic paradigm. To be sure, Ramos is clearly troubled by the instrumental rationality that induces individuals (with the psychological inclinations so embedded in our market-centered society) to accept without questioning its distortive impingement upon human existence at large. How can we, he asks, resist the prevailing trends of the market-centered society?

To combat *homo economicus* Ramos developed an alternative: the Parenthetical Man (RAMOS, 1971; AZEVÊDO; ALBERNAZ, 2006; PAULA, 2007, p. 183-5). Rather than organization man,

A atitude parentética transcende a organização, é uma característica destreza da vida culta, de existêncica superior, ciosa de liberdade, que defende o ser humano contra o embrutecimento, a rotinização mental, a alienação" (RAMOS, 1963, p. 149).

Along with his model of a para-economic – beyond economic – man, he then developed a model of a multi-dimension society: the para-economic paradigm of his Theory of Social Systems Delimitation, which delimits the market mechanism as one among many different social enclaves. This para-economic paradigm is based upon what he aptly called the "law of requisite variety" which states "that a variety of social systems is an essential qualification of any society which is responsive to its members' basic needs of actualization, and that each of these social systems prescribes design requisites of its own" (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 136). Writing seven years after Ramos wrote these words, Chantal Mouffe proposed a similar sentiment: "A project of radical and plural democracy...requires the existence of multiplicity, of plurality...and sees them the *raison d'être* of politics" (MOUFFE, 1988, p. 41).

Key to the Theory of Social Systems Delimitation was a multi-dimensional (i.e. beyond the market dimension) model of human society that could adequately incorporate human multi-dimensionality, especially substantive rationality along with functional rationality. For Ramos, humans are more than economic reckoning beings, and so an adequate theory of society requires the recognition of multiple settings in which humans can realize personal fulfillment and enjoy (non-economic) human associated life, while also participating in economic activities.

Therefore, by social systems 'delimitation' Ramos sought to 'delimit' the market; not abolish it but recognize its limitations. He especially sought to identify other settings in which humans act. His language in *The New Science* was at times less

clear than he probably would have liked, and he himself was clear that *The New Science* was not his final word on this topic that he was still working out in his own mind. Indeed, both his (1976) 'preliminary statement' on social systems delimitation, and the 1981 *A New Science*... calls these other settings economy, isonomy, and phenonomy, terms also used in, for instance, a 1979 interview in *Jornal do Brasil*. However, in a series of newspaper interviews (1981b, 1981c, 1981d, 1981e; see also SERVA, 1990) just before his death he was offering five "sistemas de produção" in Brazil: what economists would call oligopoly and competitive markets, a fairly rare "fronteirico" which included elements of various of the other systems, and two final categories of "quase formal" and "conviviais e comunitários". But the thrust of his social systems delimitation was to recognize the existence of other social settings beyond those satisfying self-interest through market mechanisms. These would include such things as organizational social responsibility, non-profit organizations working for public purposes through market mechanisms, grant funded public service nonprofits, informal collective action for public purposes, as well as non-market individual activity aimed at personal growth or enjoyment (SALM, CANDLER; VENTRISS, 2006, p. 529-34).

Critical here is that Ramos's multi-dimensionality goes beyond seeing these non-market settings as alternative 'tools' for service delivery (see HOOD, 1986; SALAMON, 2002). As Azevêdo and Albernaz put it:

O modelo multidimensional proposto por Guerreiro Ramos expande a noção de recursos e de produção – reduzidas pelo mercado apenas a insumos e produtos de atividades de natureza econômica –, já que leva em consideração tanto as atividades remuneradas quanto as não remuneradas, tanto as que geram produção econômica como as que geram produção de outra natureza. (AZEVÊDO; ALBERNAZ, 2004, p. 23)

But Ramos adds here not just a theoretical point, but a determination in actually designing the salient dimensions of any social system – the features of technology, size, space, cognition, and time (see also SERVA, 1992, and VENTRISS, 1994). Before proceeding any further, we need to step back for a moment to fully comprehend his broad argument. He contends in somewhat sweeping historical terms that the Greeks and other premodern societies were aware that the economy was a subset of the biophysical system (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 33). According to Ramos, these societies were also aware that the needs of individuals were inexorably limited. However, in the sixteenth century, the market was no longer limited to the provision of basic goods and services as food, shelter, clothes, transportation and other basic services, but rather expanded to 'demonstrative' (his term) goods and services that are designed to reflect one's social status, which, in turn, are socially constructed and are viewed as unlimited (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 90). Similarly, under these conditions, it is no wonder that it is the 'joyful jobholder' which enumerates the cardinal criterion for defining the social significance of the individual. In pre-industrial societies, he claims, individuals "were productive and had occupations without necessarily being jobholders" (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 88).

For Ramos, the pivotal issue is how we can design social systems in which the market economy is considered as only one (and a delimited) part of the total social fabric. It is important to point out that Ramos was heavily influenced by the writing of Karl Polanyi (1971), George Dalton (1971), and especially the works of Herman Daley (1973) and Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen (1975). These last two thinkers had a direct influence on what is now referred to as ecological economics. Ramos was arguing, long before it became fashionable, that

governmental policies are now becoming inoperative since they are increasingly thwarted by bio-physical constraints of production and resource allocation which standard economics overlooks or claims for within its conventional framework as 'exogenous variables' (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 82).

As a result, as Wilson Pizza Junior notes, "organizações internacionais e associações de defesa do meio ambiente proliferam como isonomias e fenomenias"

(PIZZA JR, 1991, p. 20). It is with this context that Ramos defines the para-economic paradigm:

In opposition to the prevailing market-centered approach to social systems analysis and design, the para-economic paradigm postulates a society diversified enough to allow its members to deal with substantive life issues according to their pertinent intrinsic criteria and in the specific settings where those issues belong. From the para-economic political viewpoint, not only economies which already constitute the market enclave, but also [a variety of social settings]...are to be considered agencies through which manpower and resource allocation is to occur... In other words, like economics, [and other social settings] must also be considered legitimate agencies required for the viability of society at large (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 153).

Guerreiro Ramos' Scholarship on Globalization

Alberto Guerreiro Ramos identified a critical problem in the organizational theory of his day, and offered a fundamental rethinking of the science of organizations to address this problem that remains relevant even today. Beyond this, he should also remain relevant to contemporary global scholars because his work dealt directly with issues of global integration. More important, his unusual background 'in-between' critical cleavages of class, nation, race, and intellectual formation allowed him to develop an approach to the social sciences that sought to overcome – build bridges between – these potential sources of epistemic parochialism.

Prior to his exile to the United States, Ramos's research had an especially strong emphasis on what came to be known as 'development studies'. Interest in the process of economic and social development has its origins at least in Adam Smith's 1776 identification of the division of labour and the size of markets, all within a robust free market system, as explaining 'the nature and causes of the wealth of nations'. Of special relevance to the works of Guerreiro Ramos, another approach was Vladimir Lenin's expansion on Marxist theory to argue that the underlying logic of Smith's capitalism would see it take on increasingly global forms, as surplus capital in the early industrializers was invested in the colonies of these countries. The result would be the exploitation of these 'peripheral' colonial societies by the advanced capitalist, industrialized 'core' through these global markets.

To simplify greatly: the end of the second world war led to the decolonization of over 100 of these former colonies, many of whom shared with Brazil levels of development below those of the former colonial powers (RAMOS 1965, p. 147-64). Given the "fato ecumênico e universal" (RAMOS, 1967, p. 40) of modernity, social scientists sought pragmatic solutions to this development imperative. Not surprisingly, given the 'East v. West', capitalist US v. communist USSR axis on which global politics turned in the post war era, the early debate in development studies tended to focus on the choice between these two models. On the one hand there was the 'invisible hand' of Adam Smith's free markets, notably advocated by Rostow's 'stages of growth', in which developing societies were urged to emulate the recipe of the capitalist core (ROSTOW, 1960). On the other hand there was the very visible hand of Lenin's developmental state, notably advocated by Andre Gunder Frank (1967, p. 120), on the logic that integration into global markets "can not offer any way out of underdevelopment in Latin America" (p. xi).

Guerreiro Ramos essentially argued that this choice between Smith and Lenin was a false one. Rather than choosing between the models offered by these two epistemic hegemonies, developing societies should assess elements of these and other models of development, and adopt an approach that is "crítico-assimilativo da experiência estrangeira" (RAMOS, 1996, p. 74; PAULA, 2007, p. 170-5). Sadly, this approach was only sporadically adopted in the world in the subsequent half century, either in geo-politics or in scholarship. The either/or, capitalism v. socialism dichotomy of the Cold War may have lost much of its oomph on the collapse of the Soviet Union, but global scholarship, at least in public administration, remains fairly balkanized. In a study of Australia, Brazil, Canada and the United States, Candler

(2008), for instance, has argued that there is considerable evidence of diversity in paradigmatic influences among the four cases. Scholars in the US and Australia were far more likely to adopt the market-oriented New Public Management approach than those in Canada or Brazil, while only Brazilians were likely to engage post-modern or Marxist approaches.

Similarly, the contemporary global economic recession can readily be attributed to ideological narrowness, with even prominent conservative sources acknowledging this. By way of two examples: Alan Greenspan, former Chairman of the United States Federal Reserve, recently admitted in Congressional testimony to having been "in a state of shocked disbelief" that he had been wrong to advocate deregulation and instead look "to the self interest of lending institutions to protect shareholder's equity" (GREENSPAN, 2008); and the impeccably libertarian *Economist* news magazine conceded:

Finance needs regulation. It has always been prone to panics, crashes and bubbles (in Victorian times this newspaper was moaning about railway stocks, not house prices). Because the rest of the economy cannot work without it, governments have always been heavily involved (GREENSPAN, 2008).

Lack of 'delimitation' of the market sector can readily be seen as at the root of this economic collapse.

Guerreiro Ramos as Global Scholar?

In the "chamada de trabalhos" for this symposium, Prof. Tenório quotes a recent *Folha de São Paulo* article that asserts Guerreiro Ramos "Morreu no exílio, esquecido". This may be a bit over-stated, and as we argue (CANDLER; VENTRISS, 2006, p. 495) there is ample evidence of the continued relevance of Guerreiro Ramos in Brazil. Outside of the country is another matter. Two decades ago João Benjamin da Cruz Junior argued that the Theory of Social Systems Delimitation had especially had an impact "principalmente nos Estados Unidos, mas também em diversos outras nações" (CRUZ JR, 1988, p. 18), but the examples offered to support this assertion were largely USC students of Ramos himself. This influence has not been insignificant, indeed Harmon (2003), especially, credits Ramos with inspiring the Public Administration Theory Network, and its journal *Administrative Theory & Praxis*. On the other hand, in the introduction to a recent symposium on Alberto Guerreiro Ramos in the American journal *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, two of us argued that Ramos was under appreciated outside of Brazil (CANDLER; VENTRISS, 2006). The 1964 coup was a particularly cruel blow for him (see, for instance, TENÓRIO, 2002, p. 9), as the position of respect and influence that he had gained, against the odds in Brazil, was slowly stripped from him. He ended up in the United States which, on the one hand, he enjoyed for its "paz, estabilidade, respeito, poder" (OLIVEIRA, 1995, p. 176), but on the other he found "as a Brazilian scholar with a European background, I am not so comfortable with the state of social science in America, which in my view is fraught with serious fallacies" (RAMOS, 1977). In our 2005 article, we present comments from a journal reviewer who essentially argued that Ramos's scholarship was too sophisticated for an American audience. However, rather than presenting this to those willing to accept the challenge to learn from this unusual global scholar, instead recommending rejecting the article (VENTRISS; CANDLER, 2005, p. 352).

We implied, of course, that Guerreiro Ramos was being ignored by global scholarship, despite his having written on contemporary issues in global epistemology, despite having written on the process of globalization, and despite he himself having been a rare, 'in-between' participant in these discussions whose background therefore offered global diversity outside of the Anglophone, North Atlantic world in which he found himself. To provide a bit more evidence to support this assertion, Table 1 below looks at the number of citations listed in Google Scholar for five of Ramos's works that were published in both English and

Portuguese. As can be seen, all of these works – four articles and one book – were cited far more in their Portuguese language version than in their English language version. For instance, the English language *New Science of Organizations* was cited by only 102 sources. On the other hand, the Portuguese language *A nova ciência das organizações* was cited by 284 other works. Put differently: the version of the book written in a language spoken by perhaps 4% of the world's population was cited four times as much as the version written in the world's lingua franca, spoken by perhaps one sixth of the world's population. This, too, despite the book having been written in North America, and being void of Brazilian references.

Table 1 – Engagement with Alberto Guerreiro Ramos Compared

The new science of organizations (U Toronto, 1981)	102	A nova ciência das organizações (FGV, 1981)	284
Modernization: Towards a Possibility Model (chapter in Betting and Totten 1970)	7	A modernização em nova perspectiva - em busca do modelo de possibilidades (RAP 1983)	11
Models of man and administrative theory (PAR 1972)	6	Modelos de homem e teoria administrativa (RAP 1984)	42
The new ignorance and the future of public administration in Latin America (ASPA 1970)	1	A nova ignorância eo futuro da administração pública na América Latina (RAP 1970)	11
Misplacement of concepts and Administrative Theory (PAR 1978)	1	A Teoria administrativa ea utilização inadequada de conceitos (RAP 1983)	9

Worse, his pre-exile Portuguese-language research, not least that dealing with development theory, is rarely cited by anyone other than Brazilians writing in Portuguese. Oddly, this lack of integration is evident even in Ramos's own work. His early, 1950s work on social equity, for instance, addressed precisely the sort of substantive concerns that were at the heart of his *A Nova Ciência*. Yet there is no mention of this, even of equity concerns, in this latter work. Similarly, his large body of influential work in Brazil was rarely mentioned in his subsequent English language scholarship.

Why Ramos himself failed to integrate his pre-exile Brazilian scholarship into his post-exile writing in the United States cannot be answered by us, despite two of us (one Brazilian, one North American) having been his students at the University of Southern California. But why Alberto Guerreiro Ramos has had less influence outside of Brazil than he should have can be at least partly understood by returning to the global epistemic balkanization addressed at the end of the last section. Lack of paradigmatic diffusion may be explained, especially in the English-speaking world, by linguistic self-isolation and so epistemic parochialism. While it is widely understood that British, Americans, Australians, even Anglo-Canadians are more likely to be monolingual than are citizens of other countries, this trend also appears to hold in scholarship in public affairs. In a comparison of American, Brazilian and French scholarship in public administration, one of us found that Americans are less likely to cite sources in a language other than English, than French or Brazilian scholars are likely to cite sources in a language other than their own *and English*. As the study concluded:

So given that multi-lingual Brazilian and French scholars have found work worth referencing outside of both their own, and of [English]; that Americans rarely cite anything not written in English would appear to be a result of monolingualism— the failure to develop linguistic research tools critical for cross-cultural research— rather than the lack of relevant work in other languages. (CANDLER, 2006, p. 551)

Follow-up research confirmed this more broadly: Australian, Anglo-Canadian, American and British (to a somewhat lesser extent) scholarship is less likely to be multi-lingual; while work from Brazil, France, Portugal, and Québec is much more likely to draw on references in two or more languages. The same trend of epistemic parochialism holds in terms of the country of origin of sources cited. In English language articles in *Canadian Public Administration*, for instance, 97% of citations in

articles sampled were from Canada, the United States or the United Kingdom. The American (94%) and Australian (90%) journals showed similarly narrow concentration on sources from three Anglophone countries. On the other hand, global scholarship – robust engagement with both the domestic literature, as well as a broad engagement with the global literature – was evident in the Brazilian, Portuguese, Philippine, Indian and French journals (CANDLER; AZEVÊDO; ALBERNAZ, 2008, p. 9-15).

In short, in the North America in which Alberto Guerreiro Ramos did what he thought was his most important work, the intellectual milieu was both paradigmatically narrow and culturally insular. A scholar of Guerreiro Ramos's breadth was unlikely to be understood. So we would argue that his scholarship has not had global reach, but that is the fault of 'international' scholars, not Guerreiro Ramos.

Conclusion

Suggesting remedies for the epistemic parochialism that has contributed to Alberto Guerreiro Ramos's lack of influence outside of Brazil is probably inappropriate here. The Anglophone scholars who are the problem are unaware of *Organizações e Sociedade*, and besides, the Candler (2006) and Candler, Azevêdo and Albernaz (2008) articles suggest remedies, and are better targeted to this audience. So instead in these concluding comments we will focus on some of the implications of Guerreiro Ramos's intellectual legacy. A couple of issues especially warrant our attention. First, he makes a forceful argument that quality and growth can also emerge "from a variety of outputs delivered by non-exchange allocative processes" (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 154). What we see now is the abdication of all productive processes as synonymous with market allocations that has, as a result, defined the individual as an economizing being whose contributions are determined, to a large degree, by efficacy in delivering market goods and services. Circling back to his idea concerning the jobholder, the para-economic paradigm specifies a conception of production that incorporates both remunerated and non-remunerated activities alike. Given that governmental strategies have ignored such notions, "governmental allocative policies have been unable to reach out of the vicious circle of the market system in order to take advantage of existing possibilities of building a variety of cashless productive settings as part of a multicentric society" (RAMOS, 1981a, p. 155).

Second, saying this, Ramos recognized that there is an inherent tension in the human psyche between those potent forces that encourage incessant production, distribution, and consumption integral to the modern market, and, at the same time, the critical importance of allowing the existence of other enclaves congruent for the convivial and substantive pursuits of the individual. In many respects, Ramos was implying that we are all "in-betweeners"; and given this reality, the challenge before us is how well we can effectively delimit the market, particularly in regards to its tendencies to commodify all social spaces of lived social environments.

Ramos is constantly nudging us to rethink the epistemological and sociomorphic approaches we take as an historical given. Although it is true that most of what he proposed is sketched in inchoate terms, he does pose a challenge – especially once the ideological underpinnings of the prevailing social science have been exposed – that we must take seriously the endeavor to develop a viable alternative mode of inquiry that is truly suited for restorative processes. Such a reconceptualization, he believed, is the real task before us; a reconceptualization still left unfinished, but with a genuine hope we suspect that he was pointing us in the right general direction for a new science of organizations.

- ARENDDT, Hanna. *The human condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- AZEVEDO, Ariston; ALBERNAZ Renata Ovenhousen. A paraeconomia como modelo e paradigma para a análise e a formulação de políticas públicas: o resgate de uma possibilidade. *Em Tese*, n. 2, p. 20-32, 2004.
- _____. Alberto Guerreiro Ramos's anthropological approach to the social sciences: the parenthetical man. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, v. 28, n. 4, p. 501-21, 2006.
- BERLIN, Isaiah. Does political theory still exist. In: LASLETT, P.; RUNCIMAN, W.G. (eds.) *Philosophy, Politics and Society*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1962.
- CANDLER, Gaylord George. Linguistic diglossia and parochialism in American public administration: the missing half of Guerreiro Ramos's Redução Sociológica. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, v. 28, n. 4, p. 540-61, 2006.
- _____. Epistemic community or Tower of Babel? Theoretical diffusion in public administration. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, v. 67, n.3, p. 294-306, 2008.
- _____; AZEVEDO, Ariston; ALBERNAZ Renata Ovenhousen. Toward global scholarship in public administration. Minnowbrook III conference, Lake Placid, New York, September, 2008.
- _____; VENTRISS, Curtiss. Introduction to the Symposium: Why Guerreiro? *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, v. 28, n. 4, p. 495-500, 2006.
- CAPITALISM at bay. *The Economist*, 16 October, 2008, online edition: <<http://www.economist.com/>>. Accessed 15 November 2009.
- CRUZ JUNIOR, João Benjamin da. Organização e administração de entidades públicas: aspectos políticos, econômicos e sociais de um paradigma emergente. *Revista de Administração Pública*, v. 22, n.3, p. 3-21, 1988.
- DALEY, Herman. *Toward a steady-state economy*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 1973.
- DALTON, George. *Primitive, archaic and modern economies*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.
- DEUTSCH, K.W. *The nerves of government*. New York: The Free Press, 1960.
- FRANK, Andre Gunder. *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967.
- GEORGESCU-ROEGEN, Nicholas. The entropy law and the economic problem. In: DALEY, H. (ed.). *The Steady-State Economy*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 1975.
- GREENSPAN, Alan. Testimony, Committee of Government Oversight and Reform, United States House of Representatives, 23 October, 2008. Available online, at: <http://oversight.house.gov/documents/20081023100438.pdf>
- HARMON, Michael. PAT-NET turns twenty-five: a short history of the public administration theory network. *Administrative Theory & Practice*, v. 25, n. 2, p. 157-72, 2003.
- HOOD, Christopher. *The tools of government*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers, 1996.
- MOUFFE, C. Radical democracy: modern or postmodern. In: ROSS, A. (ed.). *Universal abandon? The politics of postmodernism*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1988.
- OLIVEIRA, Lucia Lippi. *A sociologia do Guerreiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Editor UFRJ, 1995.
- PARSONS, Talcott. Evolutionary universals in society. *American Sociological Review*, v. 29, n. 3, p. 339-57, 1964.
- PAULA, Ana Paula Paes de. Guerreiro Ramos: resgatando o pensamento de um sociólogo crítico das organizações. *Organizações & Sociedade*, Salvador, v. 14, n. 40, p. 169-88, 2007.

PIZZA JUNIOR, Wilson. Administração e meio ambiente. *Revista de Administração Pública*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 25, n. 4, p. 12-24, 1991.

POLANYI, Karl. *The great transformation*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.

RAMOS, Alberto Guerreiro. *Mito e verdade da revolução brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahares Editores, 1963.

_____. *A redução sociológica*. Rio de Janeiro: ISEB, 1965.

_____. A modernização em nova perspectiva: em busca do modelo da possibilidade. *Revista de Administração Pública*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 1, n. 2, p. 7-44, 1967.

_____. The parenthetical man. *Journal of Human Relations*, n. 19, p. 463-87, 1971.

_____. Theory of social system delimitation: a preliminary statement. *Administration & Society*, 8, p. 249-72, 1964.

_____. Letter to R. Davidson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 10 October, 1977.

_____. Um modelo corretivo do impasse econômico. *Jornal do Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro, 8 jul. 1979. p. Especial, 2-3.

_____. *The new science of organizations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981a.

_____. Sociólogo diz que Brasil 'fabrica' nova revolução. *Diário do Paraná*, Curitiba, p. 6, 1 jul. 1981b.

_____. Guerreiro Ramos propõe modelo socio-econômico para o Brasil, *Folha do Comércio*, São Paulo, 14, 20 jul. 1981c (não paginado).

_____. Notícia sobre a nova teoria econômica, *Jornal do Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro, 26 jul. 1981d. p. Especial 4-5.

_____. RAMOS, Alberto Guerreiro. Problemas alocativos de economia brasileira, *Jornal do Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro, 2 ago. 1981e. p. Especial, p. 5.

_____. *A redução sociológica*. 3ªed. Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ, 1996.

ROSTOW, Walt Whitman. *The stages of economic growth: a non-Communist Manifesto* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

SALAMON, Lester. *The tools of government: a guide to the new governance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

SALM, José Francisco; CANDLER, Gaylord George; VENTRISS, Curtis. The theory of social systems delimitation and the reconceptualization of public administration. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, v. 28, n. 4, p. 522-39, 2006.

SERVA, Maurício. Contribuições para uma teoria organizacional brasileira. *Revista de Administração Pública*, v. 24, n. 2, p. 10-21, 1990.

_____. A importação de metodologias administrativas do Brasil – uma análise semiológica. *Revista de Administração Pública*, v. 26, n. 4, p. 128-44, 1992.

TENÓRIO, Fernando. *Tem razão a administração?* Ijuí: Editora Unijuí, 2002.

VENTRISS, Curtis. Public administration and the changing nature of space. *American Review of Public Administration*, v. 24, n. 1, p. 1-23, 1994.

_____; CANDLER Gaylord George. Alberto Guerreiro Ramos twenty years later: a new science still unrealized in an era of public cynicism and theoretical ambivalence. *Public Administration Review*, v. 65, n. 3, 2005.

WOLIN, S. Fugitive democracy. *Constellations*, v. 1, n. 1, p. 18, 1994.

Artigo recebido em 28/06/2009.

Artigo, aprovado, na sua versão final, em 09/12/2009.