

Managements of development and Development of management: one-sidedness of the reified dialogicity symbiosis of man / nature

Gestões do desenvolvimento e desenvolvimentos da gestão: da unilateralidade reificada à dialogicidade da simbiose homem/natureza

Carlos Eduardo Justen¹

Luís Moretto Neto²

Abstract

This article, in the form of a theoretical essay, by situating cultural phenomena of the management and development, in its traditional conception, the project of modernity and identify the predominant sidedness reified in the interface between management and development – at first sight as an instrument technician submissive to the classical pathway of development –, sought to highlight the potential for understanding and building alternatives, both for management and for the development of new meaning from this interface. To this end, the effort was directed to the redemption that is common to the phenomena of management/development – substrates anthropological and ecological – nucleated on the principles of reciprocity dialogical, concretizing the anthropological condition, and finitude, characterizes the ecological condition. At the end, were built eight potential contributions from the renewed exploration of interface management/development. It was proposed also the substitution of instrumental logic of financial efficiency, common to the traditional conception of the phenomena studied, by the logic of symbiosis dialogical man/nature, since such social phenomena, development and management, mediated by the environment, are also ecological its essence.

Keywords: Management. Development. Dialogicity. Symbiosis.

Resumo

Este artigo, ao situar culturalmente os fenômenos da gestão e do desenvolvimento, em sua concepção tradicional, no projeto da modernidade e ao identificar o predomínio da unilateralidade reificada na *interface* entre gestão e desenvolvimento – a primeira vista como instrumento técnico submisso à via clássica do segundo – almeja evidenciar as potencialidades da compreensão e da construção de alternativas, tanto para a gestão como para o desenvolvimento, a partir da ressignificação dessa *interface*. Para tanto, o esforço foi direcionado ao resgate do que é comum aos fenômenos da gestão e do desenvolvimento – os substratos antropológico e ecológico –, nucleados nos princípios da reciprocidade dialógica, concretizadora da condição antropológica, e da finitude, caracterizadora da condição ecológica. Ao final, são apresentadas oito potenciais contribuições advindas da exploração renovada da *interface* entre a gestão e o desenvolvimento. Propôs-se, ainda, a substituição da lógica instrumental da eficiência financeira, comum à concepção tradicional dos fenômenos estudados, pela lógica da simbiose dialógica homem/natureza, uma vez que, como fenômenos sociais, desenvolvimento e gestão, mediados pelo meio, também são ecológicos em sua essência.

Palavras-chave: Gestão. Desenvolvimento. Dialogicidade. Simbiose.

Paper received on October 31st, 2012 and accepted for publication on May 8th, 2013.
This version corresponds to the translated text of the original paper in Portuguese.

¹ Doctoral Candidate of Business Administration at Federal University of Santa Catarina – CPGA/UFSC. Address: Servidão Leovigildo João Vicente, 25, Sul do Rio, zipcode: 88140-000, Santo Amaro da Imperatriz-SC, Brazil. Email: justencarlos@gmail.com

² Doctor of Production Engineering at Federal University of Santa Catarina – UFSC; Deputy Professor of Federal University of Santa Catarina. Address: CAD/UFSC – Federal University of Santa Catarina, Campus Universitário Reitor João David Ferreira Lima, Trindade, zipcode: 88040-970, Florianópolis-SC, Brazil. Email: moretto@cse.ufsc.br

Initial Considerations

Bringing up development and management together involves critical and creative skills of the goldsmith, who, recognizing the gross production in its essence and using the sensitivity and cognitive creativity for his benefit, can develop the symbiosis between environment and man in its fullness. It implies, at the core, to exercise criticism in an investigative effort to not reduce the reality in what exists (SANTOS, 1999) – distinguishing between epistemological and ideological content based on the notions of management and development and pointing the *interfaces* and natural and built omissions - as well as the disruptive imagination - that enable the exercise of an aesthetic-expressive rationality founded on pleasure, authorship and discursive arts based on and reality and therefore able to build a knowledge-emancipation “[...] created and disseminated through argumentative discourse” (SANTOS, 2000, p. 95).

Since the end of World War II, when the first work on economic development came out and the deriving field of discipline became independent from political economy (SEN, 1988), the theme of development has made increasingly as one of the fundamental nucleus of social science. The works then formulated, in general, or shed to the strict economic area, translating development by binomial growth of the productive forces and technological modernization or with greater intensity from the 1970s, brought the support of other disciplinary and epistemological theories, enabling the building of relationships between development, environment, governance systems and life quality; however, in many cases, the absence of cleavages and, paradoxically, the perfect combination with econometric theory (SACHS, 1986a; SIEDENBERG, 2004).

The genesis of the concept of development results from the idea of progress, which emerged during the Renaissance and expanded during Enlightenment, with indelible marks of the modernity project. Before, the fate of decadence and social immobility dominated. The notion of progress established, step by step, a new concept of world and future, based on the implication that the course of natural and historical events was linear and progressive, so that each term of the series would increase value if compared to the preceded one (ABBAGNANO, 1999; HEIDEMANN, 2009; RAMOS, 2009).

On its hand, the organization, the theory originated from it and the practices that are established because of it are elements of the modernity project, serving as ideological and discursive instruments that promote the promises of modernity - progress, equality, freedom and emancipation of man - which, with the strengthening of the convergence between capitalism and modernity, became at the same time, incompatible and unachievable in a reality of inequality, defrags and imperialisms.

As an instrument to serve modernity, the organizational project exercised two elementary functions. One, epistemological, constituting the place par excellence for the development of the paradigm that characterized modern science, marked, for summary, by the distinction of the individuals/object and nature/society and the simplification of the real complexity of mathematical formulations, deterministic mechanisms and functional causality, in addition to the disengagement between scientific knowledge and common sense. The other, sociocultural, as a mechanism that legitimizes the supremacy of market basic rule over all areas of human life associated, before the widespread technical and moral superiority of the organizations.

Thereby, the management and development have marked recursion, either from the point of view of historical materiality - both, at the same time, sustain and uphold to/ for the project of modernity - either under the aspect of practical and social *interfaces*, given that the organization is the modern *locus* of reason and material progress.³ This is the first of the assumptions on which this article is based. The other involves the realization that, in the context of modernity, the *interface* between development and management is

³ This assumption is based on the idea, developed during the article, that development and management are concepts based in a cultural basis - of the modernity - which, in turn, does not matter in discarding these pure and simple elements of understanding social reality, before the crisis of modernity, but in giving a new meaning to their content.

addressed from the perspective of reified unilateralism: management⁴ is understood as a technical instrument for development, in a relationship considered natural.

As a corollary, the management relinquishes of its human and ecological substrates, evidenced as imperative that intends to produce or transmit knowledge and practices targeted to a production valued in economic terms, that is, the relationship means / ends, implying the reification of social relations and reduction of man to the status of production object (FOURNIER and GREY, 2000). The development, in turn, is conceived under the sign of the exaggerated specialization and economic mono-production in technocratic and managerial perspective, treated as technical instrument “[...] for effective implementation of the objectives postulated by political power” (SACHS, 1986a, p. 28).

Exploring the interfaces between management and development, through the managements of development and developments of management, from the postulates of the criticism and emancipatory imagination, enables the reflection towards a more ecological management, i.e., imbricated in the human natural environment and constituted as essential by personal experiences mediated and permeated by the surrounding environment, as well as toward a more anthropological development, which recognizes the human political condition, making it a “[...] social learning process through which men learn to identify their margins of freedom, to invent ways to take advantage of them and make decisions” (SACHS, 1986a, p. 28).

The managements of development and the development of management, plural, once located in the historical possibility, deserve to be treated under the aegis of dialogical reciprocity, in a relation between individuals well situated in a wide and intricate network of relationships, essence of their existence, and the finiteness condition for the exercise of historical responsibility before the ecological community, since the future is possible for man, as stated by Enriquez (1997), not only by present actions, but also by how he registers, accepts and (dis)figure the history.

Therefore, this article adopts the following cycle: (i) first, dealing with the development managements, or, in other words, with the historical possibility to build alternative of development from the management, (ii) addressing, then, the thematic of the developments of management, establishing the outline for guiding the management resignification when viewed from the perspective of development, and, finally, (iii) exploiting the potential of these *interfaces* when based on a new basis - dialogical reciprocity and finitude.

Managements of Development: depletion of the Classical View to the more Anthropological and Ecological Alternative

Firstly we need to establish the position on the concept of development defended in this article, characterized as the “[...] learning process of society, oriented for identification and satisfaction on a sustainable basis of human needs, both material and nonmaterial, socially and culturally determined” (SACHS, 1986b, p. 54), from “[...] people's capabilities to lead the kind of life they value - and with reason” (SEN, 2000, p. 32). This concept enables to show two principles upon which rests the notion of development - the anthropological, with the category of the dialogical reciprocity, and the ecological, with the category of finitude - which gives rise to the exploration of other interfaces between development and management that are not those one-sidedness reified. However, the position defended shows up much more an alternative than concreteness, given the predominance in the real world of which we call here: the classical view of development.

The classic developmentalism, established under this discussion, is formed by the following assumptions: (i) the binomial formed by economic growth - measured by growth of Gross National Product or Gross Domestic Product - and for the technological modernization, which stimulate each other (MARTINS, 2002;

⁴ Understood in the sense of strategic management, *management* as defining exposed throughout the article.

OLIVEIRA, 2003); (ii) economic bias, treating economic growth as a goal and marginalizing social, political and cultural objectives, “[...] as democratic participation in decision making, equitable distribution of the results of development and preservation of the environment” (SANTOS, 2005, p. 45) and “[...] most of the productive phenomena that occur in a social system” (CASTOR and FRANÇA, 1986); (iii) deterritorialized approach, without linking the view of area, especially with the “[...] technical basis and also the social practices, i.e., a technical and politic combination” (SANTOS, 2002, p. 87) and, consequently, with the local power (iv) a priori notion of the necessity to produce before and distributing afterwards, insinuating “[...] that the poorest should wait until we are more rich” (LOPES, 2006, p. 49); (v) the natural result of a logical sequence whose emergence lie in industrialization and which completion would lie in the social gains, after the economic accumulations are distributed (GAVA, 2011); (vi) approach designed and implemented from above - the so-called top-down development - a solely result of technocratic national and international agencies, without the participation of communities directly affected (SANTOS, 2005), (vii) ethnocentric and serialist focus of development, which becomes understood as “[...] the historical process of modernization, which consists of the repetition of economic , sociocultural, energetic and institutional episodes observed before in countries that are developed today” (CASTOR and FRANÇA, 1986, p. 12); and (viii) the presence of a discriminating dualism - the modern sector of the economy should override the traditional sector, archaic (FURTADO, 2007) and the consequent domination of organizational values upon individuals and state regulation upon ordinary people's lives (CASTOR and FRANÇA, 1986).

This semantic of development, from the crash of 1929 , and especially after the Second World War, acquired the feature of transition, with the "westernization" of societies known as "traditional", by imposing unconscionable values and cultural, economic and political models, in which progress and modernization were sought (SIEDENBERG, 2004). A "myth of development" was established” (FURTADO, 2005), with the poorest countries in the socioeconomic point of view seeking in the models of the richest and more developed countries the solution to their problems.

Thus, during the subsequent decades, according to Heidemann (2009, p. 26), the countries were ranked according to their position in terms of development indicators. Industrialization has become synonymous of development and the core indicators, by consequence, were of economic nature. The development therefore “meant and still means, basically implementing a market economy that includes, if not all, at least most of its citizens”.

The development policy adopted by Brazil in the last fifty years, based on encouraging industrialization and the creation of a modern economic sector, is not really different from the characters listed above. In Brazilian development process, the State assumed the position of conducting the social change process. A powerful technical-bureaucratic apparatus was created and disseminated in the key sectors of productive activity, based on three constitutive elements: (i) sector economic efficiency, which, as a deleterious consequence, compromised the optimization of the set, (ii) large scale, by the presumption that there is a positive and naturalized correlation between size and efficiency and negative and automatic between size and cost, which follows the widespread notion of productive and organizational large solutions as the most economical option for the implementation of projects and public policies and (iii) the systemic perspective, based in the adaptation of public problems from the perspective of systemic analysis and under the responsibility of a central body, unique to meet the conditions to properly formulate the ways in which the state intervention materializes (CASTOR and FRANÇA, 1986).

Thus, the myth of progress became the notion of development, which, in its turn, is operated by means of public policy. These, under the neoliberal aegis and the classic developmentalism, as seen, no longer decided by all social actors, in addition to reduce the political to the economic and economic to the market.

The classical method of development, of course, despite its hegemony and scope, did not remain impervious to criticism and alternative projects, in particular the current called "post-developmental", based on background of postmodern thought and post capitalist. Although any attempt to characterize this multifaceted current brings itself simplification, there is a tendency more or less radically expanded to

challenge the notion of development, nuclear market capitalism, doing it with the greater purpose of radical breaking with systemic notions of capitalism, Eurocentrism and globalization.

Accordingly, the idea of development, taken under the aegis of an ideology, is associated with modern economic growth and restricted to a particular context, the post-World War II, and to limited space, the European and American. The idea of development, thus, represent a myth, or, in other terms, one geoculture, that is, "[...] the historical development of a cultural pressure that leads all countries to embark on a program of 'modernization' or 'development'" (WALLERSTEIN, 2002, p. 174), serving as justification, first, that the conventional social theory made it difficult to bring out the "[...] subaltern ways of thinking and local and regional genre of shaping the world "(ESCOBAR, 2005, p. 137), and second, to move the discussion about the essential needs of the human community "[...] concentrate them in abstract goals, as investments, exports and growth" (FURTADO, 2005, p. 89-90).

In general, the post-development presents, at its core, the following assumptions: (i) focus and emphasis of the societies that have some non-compliance to the classical model of development, both in terms of time delay and structural adjustment, the so-called "Southern countries"; (ii) dispose of the progress notion, understood, especially by fans of modern-coloniality strand as a mechanism for classification and prioritization of historical experiences (LANDER, 2005); (iii) critical notions traditionally accepted on growth, poverty and foreign aid, on one hand, and vectors as the nation-state, science and multilateral organizations, on the other hand, backers of the classical notion of development, and (iv) deconstruction practices of the classical development.

We highlight, in particular, as representative of the post-developmental ideology, the works of Ferguson (1990; 1999), Escobar (1995) and Rist (2008). When Ferguson analyzed the practicability of a rural development project in Lesotho, he showed that the development acts as an anti-political instrument, expanding the power of the nation state while depoliticizing the local social fabric, because the central vectors of developmentalism - the state apparatus and multilateral organizations - when build a representation of social reality from needs to be supplied or adjustments to be charged, just formatting a rationale of intervention that prioritizes its own implementation capacity at the expense of historically situated and contextualized knowledge. In more recent work, Ferguson (1999) consolidates its understanding of development as a mythological figure that supports the interpretation of history in linear and progressive terms.

Escobar (1995), within a perspective that can be called modern-colonial, combining critique of development to the critique of modernity project, asserts that development is a discursive and practical set, an instrument effect, which prioritizes a state and economic, ethnocentric and technocratic rationality, "[...] that treats people and cultures as abstract concepts, statistics that can be moved up and down in charts of progress" (p. 44), keeping and expanding what was proposed to eliminate. Thus, the output takes place via overcoming development as a template and by the possibility of a post-development period.

According to Rist (2008) it is oriented to the demonstration that development, although apparently form a unified and consistent belief is invalidated by its internal contradictions. The numerous incremental reforms and internal criticism to traditional ideas, such as multidimensionality present in the Human Development Index and the basic needs approach, only demonstrate that the development needs momentary success showing its weakness in terms of real social transformation.

Advancing by pointing out core aspects to the theme, as the production of discourse and authoritarian social realities, timeless and not contextual, the circularity of the proposed solution in maintaining the structural causes that tries to solve the problems, environmental damage, power system regarding to it, otherness producer that reduce and sharpen the sociopolitical and cultural exclusion, the current post-developmental, in its turn, is also criticized.

Largely, they are summarized to the following points: (i) the understanding of development as a narrative of power supposedly monolithic and cohesive, unlike its reality, more diverse and less consciously orchestrated

(ZIAI, 2007); (ii) consideration of the agency capacity and resistance existing in local contexts or, in other words, the multiple strategies of appropriation and social innovation, with the development predominately subject to local social fabric, instead of external forces and timeless uniforms, in the criticism rests on what deconstructs (iii) the lack of development options, in a limited sense to any potential replacement infeasibility of universality.

Contrary to the classical pathway of development, the alternative advocated in this article, in an effort recursive approaches the perspective of post-development, the charge itself their critical and challenging, and at the same time, moves away from this current, because it recognizes the importance and centrality of the concept, although on reinforced bases, it serves both the expansion and the deepening of social imagination, "[...] not to find a model to be replicated, but [...] to find examples that must be overcome as far as possible" (SACHS, 2004, p. 368), as the invention of a national project that makes good use of nature.

Accordingly, this alternative underlines anthropological and ecological substrates of its constitution - the first based on the principle of dialogic reciprocity, the second based on the notion of finitude. The notion of finitude involves, on one hand, awareness of limited natural resources and the imposition of a consumption style less destructive and, on the other hand, the historical possibility of the human being to build alternatives, the condition to be more geared and programmed to learn (FREIRE, 1997) and characterized by its potential reflexive and deliberative capacity, which can make you think the world and thinking in the world (GAULEJAC, 2007). In General, involves a deep understanding of ecosystem functioning and its relationship to cultural systems.

At this point, the instrumental logic of management, as envisaged in the project of modernity, exerts its most perverse effects, since the positive externalities attaches to maintenance of organizational survival, in a short-term perspective, and negative externalities, such as costs of environmental degradation and social inequality, the society and the ecosystem.

If, as stated by Sachs (1986b), a seizure of more adequate interaction between natural and social processes involves recognizing human as a conscious individual of its dependence on the ecosystem, such awareness requires, by consequence, a development no more based on economic efficiency, but in the logic of the symbiosis human/ecosystem.

This brings the recognition that human may act in favor of the ecosystem immediately, since by doing so, take into account respect for the natural functioning of the surrounding environment, which occurs at least present when the following conditions: (i) human needs are realistically designed and autonomous from the local cultural tradition, ignoring the so-called demonstration effect of modern northern peoples (SACHS, 1986b), (ii) use of positive and productive complementarities and leftovers and breaks, just as occurs in the natural ecosystem, (iii) appropriate treatment of natural resources, no longer seen from the perspective of availability and price, as well as the ecological imbalances, failing to be treated only when causing damage to production process, (iv) use of integrated solutions not only environmentally but also culturally legitimated thought from the time and space socially and historically constructed, (v) absence of negative ecological heritage for future generations, possible from the low incidence of decisions considered irreversible, no more likely to be outlined by future generations (SACHS, 1986b), and (vi) effective participation of people in decision making processes.

Thus, the notion of finitude, which implies recognition of symbiotic logic human/ecosystem, enables not only the harmonization of relations between human and ecosystem, but positive developments, searched from the consciousness of incompleteness and permanent motion of human search (FREIRE, 1987) and implemented in dialogicity, in the interaction human/human/environment as independent and dependent individual at the same time.

The dialogic principle of reciprocity, in its turn, comprises two aspects: (i) the interdependence - all members of a community, ecological or human, are interconnected by a vast and intricate network of relationships, and each member has their particular essential properties and, in general, their existence just happen because of

this network of relationships, and (ii) the dialogic interaction - the human being manifests itself in the act of dialogue with his neighbor, also subject, but each one, considering in its autonomy and capable of exchanging rational arguments relating to their interests within a public space for free discussion, should be treated in a social relationship on equal terms.

The notion of interdependence involves the exercise of double consciousness ethics - the diachronic solidarity with future generations (SACHS, 1986b), since the future possibilities depend on the actions implemented in the present, and synchronic solidarity with the current generation (SACHS, 1986b), because the man/nature is symbiosis, that is, the use of nature by human has intrinsic relation with the use of human by man.

The dialogic interaction, on its turn, enables to consider the development seen from “[...] people's capabilities to lead the kind of life they value and rightly so” (SEN, 2000, p. 32) identifying development actions with the materiality of everyday life - the ability of the person, considering his real condition of life, to promote the goals you have reason to value and enjoy⁵ - while exploring the substantiality of the human being - the exercise and expansion of freedom that enables the development of capabilities and opportunities of every human being.

Considering this point of view, the dichotomy underdevelopment/development and power relations are based on new implicit analytical basis, now established around the process of elimination of deprivation of liberty and the expansion of substantive freedoms effectively valued by people (SEN, 2000).

The different emphasis on capabilities/freedoms given human nature, involves the construction of a development concept also pluralistic and multi-sector, formed by social, cultural, political and economic processes, able to balance the functioning of markets with the role of government, citizens and political and social institutions, not just intended for expanding homogeneous given dimension, as real income or utility (SEN, 1993; 2000).

Accordingly, having real opportunity of choice is, by consequence, indispensable characteristic. Two paths converging flow from it: freedom can be expanded by public policy and, on the other hand, public policy can be influenced by effective use of participatory capacities of citizens - a kind of freedom valued by people (SEN, 1993; 2000). According to Sen (2000, p. 134), “the issue of public discussion and social participation is, therefore, central for the policymaking in a democratic structure”, and that “[...] participatory freedoms cannot be central for the analysis of public policy”.

The development in this context, therefore, takes as fundamental values the guarantees of discussion, debate, criticism and dissent open, prerequisites for the formation of properly reasoned and conscious choices. This time, the development cannot be dissociated from dialogicity present in concrete social relations, since “[...] cannot, in general, take preferences as given independently of public discussion, that is, without take into consideration whether debates and dialogues are allowed” (SEN, 2000, p. 180). The basis of anthropological notion of development is the freedom of dialogue.

One of the possibilities to, through management, make concrete the exercise of this dialogical development lies in social management, understood as the collective decision-making process, free from distortion on communication, “[...] based on the intelligibility of language, on the dialogical and on understanding as a process, transparency as a premise and on emancipation as ultimate” (CANÇADO, TENÓRIO and PEREIRA, 2011, p. 681).

Based on the concepts of substantive rationality of Guerreiro Ramos, on the critical theory of the Frankfurt School and, especially, in Jürgen Habermas and his notion of communicative action, Tenório (2007; 2008a,

⁵ It also can be noticed a cultural perspective of development, because what people actually value, obviously, varies according to the considered cultural context.

2008b) describe the social management through the double fundamental axis consisted of deliberative citizenship and communicative action.

Through deliberative citizenship, understood as “[...] legitimacy of decisions [that] must originate in processes of discussion guided by the principles of inclusiveness, participatory equality, autonomy and the common good” (TENÓRIO, 2008a, p. 41), social management would be able to serve as a link between organized civil society, State and market. The relationships between the pairs company/capital, company/State, labor/capital and social management/strategic management would occur in that order, with the predomination of the first element on the second. It would thus be a participatory process, based on dialogue and inclusion. The deliberative citizenship to Tenório (2008b, p. 167), “[...] do justice to the multiplicity of forms of communication [...]”, moral, ethical, and pragmatic and for negotiation, bonding citizens in an ethical self-understanding, based “[...] on justice, understood as a procedural guarantee of participation in equal terms” (TENÓRIO, 2008a, p. 45).

Mediated by deliberative citizenship, the social management takes place in the public sphere, “[...] intersubjective, communicative space, in which people thematize their concerns through mutual understanding” (TENÓRIO, 2008, p. 41), from social society, “[...] set of institutions with a non-economic and non-state feature” (TENÓRIO, 2008, p. 42), supported in the living world, which enables “[...] a greater proximity to the problems and demands of citizens, as well as a lesser degree of influence by the instrumental logic” (TENÓRIO, 2008a, p. 42).

The role of civil society also implies to unveiling the *tops* of the technocratic discourse that insists on undermining the autonomy of the public sphere, alleging its failure to provide the specialized *know-how* for the resolution of the issues publicly defined (TENÓRIO, 2008a). In reality, when contesting the autonomy of the public sphere, the technocracy impoverishes human autonomy itself, not recognizing the critical and deliberative skills present in humans.

Through communicative action of Habermas, in turn, the social management focuses on a language of understanding, given that in it, “[...] the truth is the promise of rational consensus, [...] it is not a relationship between the individual and his perception of the world, but rather an agreement reached through critical discussion[...]” (TENÓRIO, 1998, p. 126).

The social management, in these terms, is built on an ethic of discussion, in which men, endowed with reason and independently considered, may exchange rational arguments exchange within public space for free discussion. Individual interests are communicated through respect to “[...] requirements of validity of a discourse that has meaning, which expresses the pursuit of truth, that is sincere and it shows justice rules” (TENÓRIO, 1998, p. 16). The conditions for both the exercise of communicative rationality that marks human action as for an agreement to inter-subjectively constructed, so, are outlined, enabling to understand that equality should guide human action, whether at the organizational, whether in corporate environment (ENRIQUEZ, 1997).

Being the social management, as a possible alternative, or other proposals observed in organizational studies or under its influence, such as the Critical Management Studies (CMS), the post-structuralism, post-Fordism, Foucault's analysis and feminist theory, among others, the management will provide a support for the dialogic development when, away from the project of building a modern reality and an organizational rationality, as featured in the next section, enunciate itself as the awareness of the impossibility of a universal management that takes into account the complexity of social experience, given the inexhaustible and unlimited character of human and ecological diversity.

Accordingly, in addition to constitute itself on the possibility of another unified management, it matter looking the Social Management and other critical perspectives such as the plural possibility of other managements, constructed from situated knowledge and practices. With that, restrains the tendency of building management on its own, while it opens to identify and give value to other forms of substantive social action, unintelligible to the traditional *management*. Moreover, due, deepening the critique of strategic

management, adding to the evaluative antinomy and the recognition for its incompleteness to read a reality that requires multiple praxeological lenses.

If management, such as the case of Social Management perspective, should contribute to a more dialogical notion of development, by providing the opportunity of a concrete embodiment, developing the ability to add to this management model the ecological substrate. So, dialogicity embodying the human includes the symbiotic relationship between human and environment, that is, consideration of the environment as a subject, the recognition of the real functioning of ecosystems and the interaction of this operation with the cultural systems, the preservation of steady state maintenance mechanisms of ecosystems and the projection of human interventions based on ecological understanding of natural systems.

Development of Management: an Anthropological and Ecological Management

We argue, in particular, that the emerging societal model, feasible from the crisis of modernity project, will be placed around the notion of communication, substitute of property rights as a principle of conduction of associated human life. Thus, in a larger perspective of reflection on the concepts that the societies are preparing about themselves on increasingly rational and reflective through flexible interpretations, open to dialogical reasoning, it fits the idea of managing for deliberative processes that, recognizing the linguistic and cognitive capacity of the human being, capable of reaching truth in discursive relationships, consensually formed, allows to recognize on the other, human or any living phenomenon, the fundamental ecological principle - interdependence. This perspective strengthens the link between management and development, although differently from reified unilateralism.

This idea of management was set aside under the auspices of modern *management*. In fact, the organizational theory of the last century was a construction project of a reality and an organizational rationality subservient to the project of modernity, especially because of what we will call the organization teleology.

This is actually a teleological conception that provided the reality of associated human life not only ideological and discursive subsidies for the construction and maintenance of superiority, indispensability of the irreplaceable character of the organization as a unit of economy of production, but also for the expansion of its authority and its values to other human enclaves.

Ideological and discursive subsidies needed to consolidate the teleological conception of organization yoke to the notions that (i) social progress is a direct consequence of the successive increases in economic productivity which, in turn, stems from the technological intensification, planned and implemented under the auspices of *management* (PAULA, 2007); (ii) organizations are endowed with a moral virtue, because they would make compatible the individual and the collective rational decisions that would improve the intellectual condition, economic and social development of modern man; (iii) organizations represent the ideal *locus* for the exercise of scientific reason, freeing man from the shackles of tradition and the thought that theocratic stalled human evolution over many centuries; (iv) organizations require a technical, professional and planned conduction, leaving this responsibility to managers; (v) such managers would be supported in their activities by epistemological and ontological bases, the first focusing on translation capability and prediction of uncertainties of the real world and the second by the incarnation of the knowledge skill necessary for this task.

With the advent of industrial capitalism, the so-called organizational society emerged as representative of reason, freedom, justice and material progress. As Reed (1998) points out, to serve as an instrument of coordination between individuals interests and collective decision-making processes, organizations would ensure both order and social progress as personal freedom. This time, the formal organization became the dominant model in contemporary society and the standard of rationality inherent in it has become the general cognitive standard.

From 1980s on, with neoliberal capitalism, the teleology of the organization was intensified by managerialist movement and numerous State reforms arising from irradiated for the rest of the world by the Thatcher government (1979-1990), the United Kingdom, and the Reagan government (1981-1989), in the United States. The principles and values established by *management* were co-opted by political arena and were spread to Public Administration and the social sphere. The logic of the organization became universal and the man came to be evaluated in terms of its compatibility with the organizational society, i.e., in relation to the technical function that develops there.

Especially in the field of organizational studies, this particular vision of the organization persevered because of the dominance of the United States. Boyacigiller and Adler (1991) show that, under a socio-historical view, there is hegemony and universality of American organizational knowledge, due to the military, economic and political prominence of Yankee postwar, with the consequent importance of schools and management journals in that country. This hegemony was shaped in a particular historical context - decades from 1930 to 1950, and especially during the Second World War - in which the United States has been raised to the *status* of new research center in the highly prestigious field of natural sciences (WHITLEY, 1984).

Naturally, the success of the methods and paradigms of research in natural sciences, based on quantitative experimental research, came to the Administration and organizational studies and, due to supremacy in world geopolitics, spread over to the rest of the globe. Two factors ensured the expansionist success of American organizational knowledge: (i) American educational institutions, who exercised direct control over the process of creation and consolidation of academic teaching and research in other parts of the world, through, for example, technical missions and faculty exchange in Europe and Brazil, producing and disseminating modern techniques and knowledge management, subsidized in “administrative ethics of organizational man” (CLEGG and BIER, 2010, p. 227), this onslaught in technical rationality and especially from the neoliberal wave of the 1980s, the economic rationality, and (ii) the U.S. multinationals, who developed the concept of management professional taught along the lines of management schools in the United States. It is, therefore, a hegemonic, recursive and self-sustaining system.

The American predominance in the field of management raises the need to introduce the discussion of intellectual colonialism, that is, the questioning of those who produce valid organizational knowledge, in what context and for which recipients, i.e., interest in geopolitics of knowledge. For intellectual colonialism are understood the uneven relations, from the epistemological point of view, between two or more parts that characterize the alleged inferiority of one part against another.

The consequences of intellectual colonialism for organizational studies involve universalism and exclusivism of ontology and a specific epistemology. The ontology to be portrayed is the reality of large complex organizations, capital-intensive, knowledge and technology, surrounded by an uncertain environment which requires the application of scientific methods of forecasting and a professional, enterprising and instrumentalist profile. Decanted Epistemology is quantification, financialization, decomposition and synthesis of elements, including humans, under the protection of the neutrality of scientific values. In the field of teaching and research, administration and management predestine, in this ideology, to ensure organizational productivity in an approach to knowledge and truth confined to financial efficiency. Therefore, the man, as a resource of production should be adapted to the productive system, both in ideological and work operations.

However, paradoxically while intensified the organizational teleology begins to show signs of wear. The discursive *corpus* of technical superiority and moral virtue of the organizations is to be confronted with a reality permeated by social and economic inequality, political and cultural defrags and depletion of the biosphere, although the authoritarian incompleteness of the organizational studies avoid at all costs to prove it.

The crack opened in the hitherto solid block of teleology of the organization is connected, undoubtedly, to the overthrow of the emancipatory project of modernity, which, according to Santos (1995; 2008), after converging to capitalism, provided the opportunity, on the one hand, to the supremacy of the market over the

balance between community, state and market, and on the other hand, to the dominance of science and technology at the expense of the balance between literature / arts, law and science / technology.

If thought under the aegis of development, historical phenomenon, collective, dialogical and ecological understood as “[...] learning process of society, guided for identification and satisfaction on a sustainable basis, of human needs, material and non-material, socially and culturally determined” (SACHS, 1986b, p. 54), from “[...] people's capabilities to lead the kind of lives they value - and rightly so” (SEN, 2000, p. 32), the management is now considered anthropological phenomenon and therefore ecological, founded in primates dialogical reciprocity and finitude, deserving further developments than those of strategic instrumentality.

By reciprocal dialogic, management as anthropological phenomenon implies recognizing that the human is realized by the dialogic interaction, marked by the dual process of (i) negotiated interpretation of a common definition of the situation, and (ii) the resulting language understanding (HABERMAS, 2003). Thus, stopping linguistic and cognitive capacities, man is capable of, in the discursive relationship, reach the truth, consensually formed, “[...] an ideal consensus free from coercion, of understanding and not handled agreements” (FORESTER, 1994, p. 137).

This time, each is regarded as an autonomous being, a subject in relation to another subject, all endowed with reason and able to give their contribution. The linguistic relationship fought between individuals, not between individuals/object, becomes endowed with intersubjectivity able to perform human emancipation through social interaction.

The management coming therefrom is redefined as deliberative political action, mediated by a democratic procedure, in which individuals, regardless of the role, function or social position they occupy, decide their own destiny, the social instance in which they interact and society as a whole (TENÓRIO, 2008c). Individuals then considered concurrently in their individuality and collectively, “[...] by means of comprehensive courses of action, intended for common good and for the good way of life” (TENÓRIO, 2010, p. 58) lie on a plane of equality of conditions for participation in both societal and organizational relationships.

As a result, the organization ceases to be understood solely as a locus for the exercise of instrumental reason and material progress and shall be construed as host of linguistic interactions between capable individuals, raising the analysis and solution of communicative distortions observed in traditional management practice (manager/worker relationship, monological) and the dominant organizational model (bureaucracy and hierarchy, inhibiting communicative competence), by enabling the identification and overlapping of social restrictions and communicative unnecessary to social cooperation and democratic action, if understood as dialogically guided processes (FORESTER, 1994; VIZEU, 2005).

Through finiteness, in turn, management as ecological phenomenon implies considering that the man, while conscious that hangs relationship between equals, must also maintain awareness of their dependence on the ecosystem in which it lives. It is not a commonly considered dependency, unilateral that one of the parts has control of the other, but dialogical, bilateral, constitutive of the human being and the ecosystem.

So, it advances in the effort to strip management of positive logic internalities and negative externalities and treat the ecosystem as well as organizational actors as individuals. The result is the abandonment of theoretical and analytical concern with the instrumentality and performativity and the return to social, participation and social emancipation. The rupture here is radical. It involves the replacement of authoritarian imperatives of techniques, methodologies, processes and cognitive schemes whose objective is merely the productivity of economic/financial capital by a particular comprehension of man, endowed with the ontological vocation to be more and programmed to learn, subject of intervention, able to collectively construct an alternate reality, with the consciousness of his fostering inconclusive for an uninterrupted movement in search for what is new, different and

unknown. The future, accordingly, shall be a time of possibilities, not of fatalism (FREIRE, 2011; DEMO, 1995).

It also involves the enhancement of self-identity of regionalisms and culturalisms that although ecologically located, are capable of dialogue and the translation of multiple realities, or, in other words, able to establish itself as an alternative to the colonizer knowledge, so that both colonizer knowledge and regionalisms/culturalisms, are finite and therefore liable to complementation.

The development, considered under the aegis of ecological finiteness and therefore covering a truly collective process in essence, enables the management to redefine its way and design alternatives truly emancipating, rescuing their anthropological and ecological substrates⁶ forgotten before the autonomization of economic imperatives, for emancipation occurs only when the man is considered anthropologically imbricated in the ecosystem, in a relationship away from coercion and from unnecessary requirements associated to human life, as well as the ecosystem is considered ecologically constituent of man, for man/man relationship depends on the relationship between nature/man.

Reified Unilateralism to Dialogical Symbiosis Man/Nature

With the crisis of the project of modernity, it is necessary to rethink the phenomena of development and management, as they are designed tools to support the modern project. It is necessary to overcome, moreover, the traditional interface between management and development, designed under the perspective of reified unilateralism - the management is understood as a technical development in a relationship seen as natural.

Explore other interfaces between these phenomena, which, at its core, share their anthropological and ecological substrates - interfaces which are inside the ideas of managements of development and development management - establishing contributions and enabling both the management alternatives, seen from the eyes of the dialogical development; and development, seen from the perspective of a dialogical management:

- a) The organization ceases to be the locus of instrumental reason and material progress and becomes one of the articulators of the symbiosis human / ecosystem, thus becoming a human system based on ecological understanding of natural systems and their potential evolution of a hand, and realizing the human through the autonomous exercise of dialogism between individual, on the other hand;
- b) The logic of economic efficiency, the positive internalities and negative externalities, the prevalence of use value and short-term gives way to the primates of dialogical reciprocity and ecological finiteness, more suited to understanding the relationship between social and natural processes, which are both the essence of management and development, characterizing a man, to be mediated by the environment, is ecologic and from an ecosystem which carrying the human element in its constitution, is also anthropological;
- c) It enables reflection towards a more ecological management - since development is constituted

⁶ What is discussed on this paper is that any alternative proposal and emancipatory management must necessarily contemplate such substrates, otherwise to establish itself as a domesticated and reproductive critique of the *status quo*. Therefore, thinking about the managements of development and development of management dialogically brings significant contribution to the field of management.

- necessarily by ecological dimension – that is, imbricated in the natural / human ambient and consists essentially by mediated personal requirements and permeated by the surrounding environment;
- d) It provides the redefinition of losses, waste, leftovers and debris capable of reabsorption in the production system through the use of positive complementarities and waste, as the area ecosystem, as well as open space for the reconsideration of the omitted, silenced, repressed, coerced and discredited, treated as autonomous subjects in a relationship of equals and able to make a contribution from argumentative public discourse;
 - e) It enables advances from participatory and dialogical management models, as social management, towards a more anthropological development, recognizer of human political condition, making it a "[...] social learning process through which men learn to identify their margins of freedom to invent ways to take advantage of them and make decisions [...]" (SACHS, 1986a, p. 28);
 - f) It redefines the relationship between management and development, overcoming the reified unilateralism of management as a technique in the service of the classical pathway of development, allowing that either the management may be an important center of development through participatory management models and recognizers of human political condition, but also the development can enrich the disciplinary field of management, especially as it presents as a radiating center of the lived experience of people, its ambiguities, nonlinearities, unproductivities, hopes and repressed subjectivities;
 - g) It consolidates the way to pursue the historical possibility of human building alternatives, both from / to the development and / or management, given the understanding of reflective and deliberative capacity of man and the confidence that by intervening in the environment according to the laws of behavior of a particular ecosystem, the human being has the ability to leverage the opportunities offered by the surrounding environment. Furthermore, recognizing the dependence of man in relation to his fellow man and the ecosystem, it brings a more favorable approach to treatment of past time - whose method of recording, analysis and transmission also shapes the chances of future time, rescuing the historical element so absent of traditional management.
 - h) It substantiates an alternative for a necessary transition, because with the crisis of the project of modernity and its inability to cope with the needs and recent problems, it no longer makes sense to maintain a concept of instrumental management, subservient to a market economy and harmful to the ecosystem, as well as an economic, quantitative and uneven development.

Final Marks

From two central assumptions - first, the concepts of management and development traditionally accepted lie in a cultural framework of modernity, supporting, either from the point of view of historical materiality, or from the practical and social interfaces, the modern project, and second the interface between development and management is addressed from the perspective of reified unilateralism, with management as only submissive technical instrument to the classical pathway of development - this article explored alternatives and potentials arising from the relationships between development and management, with the postulates of the development of management and managements of development.

This new look was based on the anthropological and ecological substrates, since both development and management, are social phenomena mediated by the natural environment, one being constituent of the other. The principle of dialogical reciprocity represented an alternative towards the rescue of anthropological substrate, since the man is concretized in the interaction with his fellow human, also subject through dialogue. The principle of finiteness, on the other hand, was way towards the rescue of ecological substrate, not only a physical / natural finiteness, but mainly politics and ethics. At the end, eight not exhaustive

contributions were exposed, originated from the redefinition of the interfaces between development and management.

The message implicit in previous discussions, is that the management and development no longer intervene under the instrumental logic of financial efficiency, but rather under the substantive influence of the logic of the dialogical symbiosis man/nature. They are social phenomena and mediated by the environment, they are ecological in essence.

References

- ABBAGNANO, N. **Dicionário de filosofia**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1999.
- BOYACIGILLER, N.; ADLER, N. J. The parochial dinosaur: organizational science in a global context. **Academy of Management Review**, v. 16, n. 2, p. 262-290, Apr. 1991.
- CANÇADO, A. C.; TENÓRIO, F. G.; PEREIRA, J. R. Gestão social: reflexões teóricas e conceituais. **Cad. EBAPE.BR**, v. 9, n. 3, p. 681-703, set. 2011.
- CASTOR, B. V. J.; FRANÇA, C. Administração pública no Brasil: exaustão e revigoramento do modelo. **Rev. Adm. Pública**, v. 20, n. 3, p. 3-26, jul./set. 1986.
- CLEGG, S.; BIER, C. A. Ethics and power in business schools and organizations. **Journal of Power**, v. 3, n. 2, p. 227-242, Aug. 2010.
- DEMO, P. **Cidadania tutelada e cidadania assistida**. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados, 1995.
- ENRIQUEZ, E. Os desafios éticos nas organizações modernas. **Revista de Administração de Empresas**, v. 37, n. 2, p. 6-17, abr./jun. 1997.
- ESCOBAR, A. **Encountering development: the making and unmaking of the Third World**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- _____. O lugar da natureza e a natureza do lugar: globalização ou pós-desenvolvimento. In: LANDER, E. (Org.). **A colonialidade do saber: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais – perspectivas latino-americanas**. Buenos Aires: Clacso, 2005. p. 133-168.
- FERGUSON, J. **The anti-politics machine: “development”, depoliticization, and bureaucratic power in Lesotho**. Cambridge/Nova York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- _____. **Expectations of modernity: myths and meanings of urban life on the Zambian copperbelt**. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California, 1999.
- FORESTER, J. Teoria crítica e análise organizacional. **Plural**, v. 1, p. 131-148, 1994.
- FOURNIER, V.; GREY, C. At the critical moment: conditions and prospects for critical management studies. **Human Relations**, v. 53, n. 1, p. 7-32, jan. 2000.
- FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia do oprimido**. 17. ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1987.
- _____. **Política e educação**. 3. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 1997.
- _____. **Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa**. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2011.
- FURTADO, C. **O mito do desenvolvimento econômico**. São Paulo: 2005.
- _____. **Formação econômica do Brasil**. 34. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Companhia das Letras, 2007.

GAULEJAC, V. A ligação vale mais que o bem. In: GAULEJAC, V. **Gestão como doença social: ideologia, poder gerencialista e fragmentação social**. Aparecida, SP: Letras & Ideias, 2007. p. 285-325.

GAVA, R. Um ensaio sobre a convergência entre autodeterminação local e desenvolvimento: em foco a rearticulação produtiva e a promoção econômica e social de territórios distantes do interesse desenvolvimentista nacional. In: ENCONTRO NACIONAL DE PESQUISADORES EM GESTÃO SOCIAL, 5., 2011, Florianópolis. **Anais...** Florianópolis: 2011, p. 1-17.

HABERMAS, J. **Mudança estrutural da esfera pública: investigações quanto a uma categoria da sociedade burguesa**. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 2003.

HEIDEMANN, F. G. Do sonho do progresso às políticas de desenvolvimento. In: HEIDEMANN, F. G.; SALM, J. F. **Políticas públicas e desenvolvimento: bases epistemológicas e modelos de análise**. Brasília, DF: Ed. UnB, 2009. p. 23-39.

LANDER, E. Ciências sociais: saberes coloniais e eurocêntricos. In: LANDER, E. (Org.). **A colonialidade do saber: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais – perspectivas latino-americanas**. Buenos Aires: Clacso, 2005. p. 21-53.

LOPES, A. S. Encruzilhadas do desenvolvimento: falácias, dilemas, heresias. **Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais**, n. 75, p. 41-61, out. 2006.

MARTINS, S. R. O. Desenvolvimento local: questões conceituais e metodológicas. **Interações: Revista Internacional de Desenvolvimento Local**, v. 3, n. 5, p. 51-59, set. 2002.

OLIVEIRA, S. O. Desenvolvimento local e organização sócio-espacial. **Interações: Revista Internacional de Desenvolvimento Local**, v. 4, n. 6, p. 47-53, mar. 2003.

PAULA, A. P. P. de. **Por uma nova gestão pública: limites e potencialidades da experiência contemporânea**. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. FGV, 2007.

RAMOS, A. G. **Uma introdução ao histórico da organização racional do trabalho**. Brasília, DF: Conselho Federal de Administração, 2009.

REED, M. Teorização organizacional: um campo historicamente contestado. In: CLEGG, S. R.; HARDY, C.; NORD, W. R. (Org.). **Handbook de estudos organizacionais**. São Paulo: Atlas, 1998. p. 61-98.

RIST, G. **The history of development: from western origins to global faith**. 3. ed. London: Zed Books, 2008.

SACHS, I. **Espaços, tempos e estratégias do desenvolvimento**. São Paulo: Vértice, 1986a.

_____. **Ecodesenvolvimento: crescer sem destruir**. São Paulo: Vértice, 1986b.

_____. Experiências internacionais de um cientista inquieto: entrevista com Ignacy Sachs. **Estudos Avançados**, v. 18, n. 52, p. 353-372, 2004.

SANTOS, B. de S. **Pela mão de Alice: o social e o político na pós-modernidade**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1995.

_____. Porque é tão difícil construir uma teoria crítica? **Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais**, n. 54, p. 197-215, jun. 1999.

_____. **Crítica da razão indolente**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2000.

_____. **Semear outras soluções: os caminhos da biodiversidade e dos conhecimentos rivais**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2005.

_____. **A gramática do tempo: para uma nova cultura política**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2008.

SANTOS, M. **O país distorcido: o Brasil, a globalização e a cidadania**. São Paulo: PubliFolha, 2002.

SEN, A. The concept of development. In: CHENERY, H.; SRINIVASAN, T. N. (Ed.). **Handbook of development economics**. Amsterdam: Elsevier: 1988, v. 1, p. 9-26.

_____. O desenvolvimento como expansão de capacidades. **Lua Nova**, n. 28-29, p. 313-334, abr. 1993.

_____. **Desenvolvimento como liberdade**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2000.

SIEDENBERG, D. R. Desenvolvimento: ambiguidades de um conceito difuso. **Desenvolvimento em questão**, n. 3, p. 9-26, jan./jun. 2004.

TENÓRIO, F. G. Gestão social: uma perspectiva conceitual. **Rev. Adm. Pública**, v. 32, n. 5, p. 7-23, set./out. 1998.

_____. **Cidadania e desenvolvimento local**. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. FGV, 2007.

_____. (Re)visitando o conceito de gestão social. In: SILVA JR. et al. (Org.). **Gestão social: práticas em debate, teorias em construção**. Juazeiro do Norte, CE: Ed. UFC, 2008a. p. 39-57.

_____. **Um espectro ronda o terceiro setor: o espectro do mercado**. 3. ed. Ijuí, RS: Unijuí, 2008b.

_____. Gestão social: uma réplica. In: RIGO, A. S. et al. (Org.). **Gestão social e políticas públicas de desenvolvimento: ações, articulações e agenda**. Recife: Univasf, 2010. p. 57-62.

_____. et al. Critérios para a avaliação de processos decisórios participativos deliberativos na implementação de políticas públicas. In: ENCONTRO DE ADMINISTRAÇÃO PÚBLICA E GOVERNANÇA, 3., 2008, Salvador. **Anais...** Curitiba: Anpad, 2008.

VIZEU, F. Ação comunicativa e estudos organizacionais. **Revista de Administração de Empresas**, v. 45, n. 4, p. 10-21, out./dez. 2005.

WALLERSTEIN, I. **Após o liberalismo: em busca da reconstrução do mundo**. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2002.

WHITLEY, R. The fragmented state of management studies: reasons and consequences. **Journal of Management Studies**, v. 21, n. 3, p. 331-348, July 1984.

ZIAI, A. The ambivalence of post-development: between reactionary populism and radical democracy. In: ZIAI, A. (Ed.). **Exploring post-development: theory and practice, problems and perspectives**. London: Routledge, 2007. p. 111-128.