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ABSTRACT
The object of this article is to take a look at the influence that French-language works have had on the Brazilian academic community over the past decades, based on the author’s knowledge of it, and a long attendance of the field of Brazilian administrative sciences. To do this, the article is divided into three parts. The first recalls the relationship that the author has established with the Brazilian community to locate who is speaking and from where he is speaking. The second briefly discusses the historical link that Brazil maintains with French thought in general. And the third presents the French main intellectual currents, which, according to the author, seem to have caught the attention of Brazilian researchers in administrative sciences. This reflection ends with some considerations on the future of the field and some wishes on the future relationship between Brazilian researchers and French-speaking researchers.
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RESUME
L’objet de cet article est de jeter un regard sur l’influence que les travaux de langue française ont exercé sur la communauté académique brésilienne au cours des dernières décennies à partir de la connaissance que l’auteur en a, suite à une longue fréquentation du champ des sciences administratives brésiliennes. Pour ce faire, l’article se divise en trois parties. La première procède à un rappel de la relation que l’auteur a établie avec la communauté brésilienne pour situer qui parle et d’où il parle. La deuxième aborde brièvement le lien historique qui Brésil entretient avec la pensée française en général. Et la troisième présente les principaux courants qui semblent, selon l’auteur, avoir retenu l’attention des chercheurs brésiliens en sciences administratives. Il se conclut cette réflexion par quelques considérations sur l’avenir du champ et quelques souhaits sur la relation future entre chercheurs brésiliens et chercheurs de langue française.

MOTS CLÉS | Sciences administratives, Brésil, langue française, France, Québec.

RESUMO
O objetivo deste artigo é dar uma olhada na influência que as obras de língua francesa têm exercido sobre a comunidade acadêmica brasileira nas últimas décadas, a partir do conhecimento do autor e sua longa associação do campo das ciências administrativas brasileiras. Para isso, o artigo está dividido em três partes. A primeira lembra a relação que o autor estabeleceu com a comunidade brasileira para localizar quem está falando e onde ele está falando. A segunda discute brevemente o vínculo histórico que o Brasil mantém, de um modo geral, com o pensamento francês. A terceira apresentará as principais correntes intelectuais que parecem, segundo o autor, ter chamado a atenção dos pesquisadores brasileiros em ciências administrativas. Esta reflexão se conclui com algumas considerações sobre o futuro da área e alguns desejos sobre as futuras relações entre pesquisadores brasileiros e pesquisadores francófonos.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE | Ciências administrativas, Brasil, língua francesa, França, Québéco.
This special issue celebrates the sixtieth anniversary of RAE, to which I was kindly invited to contribute by its editor-in-chief, Maria José Tonelli. For me, this is not just an honor and witness of the long-lasting relationship I have had for over thirty years with the Brazilian administrative sciences community, but it is also acknowledgement of the friendly and intellectual ties that have been consolidated in recent years with the community of French-speaking researchers to which I belong. It is, therefore, on behalf of this intellectual and linguistic affinity that, at the request of the organizers of this edition, I shall be looking at the influence that works in the French language have had on the Brazilian academic community in recent years. I do it in a very special historical context: the global pandemic that is challenging our development model and is proving to be a real anthropological crisis (Chanlat, 2020).

This article is in three parts. The first will undertake a retrospective look at my relationship with the Brazilian community, in order to remind readers who I am and from where I am speaking. The second will briefly address the historical links that Brazil has with French thought in general. The third will present the main currents of thought that, in my opinion, seem to have sparked an interest in Brazilian researchers in administrative sciences. This reflection will end with some considerations on the prospects for our area and some wishes with regard to the future relationship between Brazilian and French-speaking researchers.

MY DISCOVERY OF BRAZIL: A BRIEF BIOGRAPHIC RECOLLECTION

Before getting to know Brazil’s sensitive reality, I had, like many other people in the world, a view of the country that stemmed in part from the often stereotypical image that one can have of it: the Amazon rainforest, Carnival in Rio, Copacabana beach, samba, soccer, etc. As a child, I actually watched the television broadcast of the semi-final of the 1958 World Cup – a first for that time – between Brazil and France, and the emergence of Pelé as one of the greatest players in the history of this sport. Of course, in 1964 I also watched the celebrated French movie, That Man from Rio, with Jean-Paul Belmondo. But I also acquired another view that came from a certain knowledge I had of the country’s history and its sociological peculiarities, which I had gathered from my friend and colleague, Allain Joly (2004), when I was living in HEC-Montreal. Allain Joly was at the time doing his PhD Fundação Getulio Vargas’s Sao Paulo School of Business Administration (Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo da Fundação Getulio Vargas [FGV EAESP]), in the early 1980s, and he later played a decisive role in my relationship with Brazil.

The first time I had any contact with a Brazilian administrative science professor was in Montreal, during the 1984-1985 academic year. At the time I was still a young professor at HEC-Montreal, and I met Roberto Fachin, a professor in the Administration School of the (Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul [EA/UFRGS]). Roberto, already an authority in the area in Brazil, came to spend a sabbatical year in Canada. In the course of the 1984-85 school year, we discussed at length the Brazilian situation in general, and management teaching in particular, above all during an important international conference on the subject that was organized in the spring of 1985 by my brother Alain and by Maurice Dufour.

In September 1990 I met again in Montreal, thanks to the mediation of Allain Joly, two important professors from FGV EAESP, Ofélia Torres and Fernando Prestes Motta, who came to take part in the major international conference I organized about the book I had just finished coordinating (Chanlat, 1990) following a sabbatical year I had spent in France, and that would quickly become a work of reference in French-speaking countries (Nugent, 1993; Padioleau, 1992; Sciences Humaines, 1998).
After their participation in the conference and the interest expressed by Professors Torres and Motta in the perspective that was developed in this work, and that today is considered pioneering (Bouville & Yousfi, 2021), a three-volume Portuguese edition would be quickly coordinated in Brazil by Ofélia Torres, with chapters being translated by various Brazilian professors, particularly from FGV EAESP (Chanlat, 1992, 1994, 1996). On the initiative of Ofélia Torres, Roberto Fachin and Tânia Fischer, and with support from National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico [CNPq]), in 1992 I was invited to take part in the launch of the first volume, and to give a series of lectures in Brazil in that same year.

That first three-week stay in Brazil took me successively to FGV EAESP, to the Administration Schools of the Federal Universities of Minas Gerais, Rio Grande do Sul and Bahia, and to Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro [PUC-Rio]), which allowed me to discover Brazil – this continent-sized country – with all its human and geographic diversity and its social fractures. These trips increased over the years and during them I met many colleagues: Valmiria Carolina Piccinini, Ana Maria Kirschner, Maria Elisabeth Antunes Lima, Suzana Braga Rodrigues, Liliana Segnini, Marlene Catarina de Oliveira Lopes Melo, Alfredo Alves de Oliveira Melo, Juvêncio Braga da Lima, Tânia Fischer, José Antônio Gomes de Pinho, Silvia Vergara, Patricia Tomei, Clovis Machado †, Maria José Tonelli, Fernando Prestes Motta †, Sigmar Malvezzi, Maria Irene Betiol, Thomaz Wood, Miguel Caldas, Bianor Cavalcanti, Eduardo Marques, Yann Duzert, Maria Esté de Freitas, Maria Teresa Fleury, Roberto Lima Ruas, Luiz Bignetti †, Fábio Bittencourt Meira, Isabella de Vasconcelos, Flávio de Vasconcelos, Angelo Soares,, Guilherme Azevedo, Marlei Pozzebon, Eduardo Diniz and Rafael Alcadipani, Sidinei Rocha-de-Oliveira, who would then become my friends. I also met several future students of mine: Eduardo Davel, Gelson Junquilo, Jair Nascimento Santos, Carolina Andion, the late José Roberto Gomes da Silva †, Maria Elisa Brandao, Marina Nakayama, Marcelo Dantas, and Mauricio Serva, with whom I have maintained a cordial and intellectual relationship ever since.

During the years I spent in Montreal, Strasbourg, and then Paris, and since my arrival in Dauphine in September 2001, I have regularly visited Brazil as an invited speaker at National Association of Graduate Studies in Administration (Associação Nacional de Pós Graduação e Pesquisa em Administração [ANPAD]), Encontro de Estudos Organizacionais da ANPAD (EnEO), and Ibero-Academy of Management congresses, at international conferences of the Federal University of Bahia (Universidade Federal da Bahia [UFBA]), which was organized by Professor Tânia Fischer in Salvador and Núcleo de Estudos sobre Poder e Organizações Locais (NEPOL), currently Centro Interdisciplinar de Desenvolvimento e Gestão Social (CIAGS). I also attended a conference in Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul (Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul [PUC-RS]) in Porto Alegre, and seminars and conferences in various public and private institutions in São Paulo, Belo Horizonte, Campinas, Brasília, São Leopoldo, Florianópolis, Porto Alegre, Bahia, Rio, Vitória, etc. On a few occasions I have also taken the opportunity to sit on various PhD examining boards, or co-supervised some theses, including one by the late José Roberto Gomes da Silva † (2010), whose tragic disappearance was heavily associated, as we all know, with this French-Brazilian relationship (Chanlat, 2010b). My supervision of Brazilian researchers would continue in Paris, where I had the pleasure to supervise the Master’s degree research dissertation of Simone Cota; I supervised Virginia Drummond’s thesis, and during his post-doctoral studies I was the supervisor of Rodrigo Bandeira de Mello, who would later join each year our teaching and research unit. Also in Paris I was on the PhD examining boards for Teresa Bicalho de Menezes, another doctoral student at Dauphine, supervised by my colleague, Professor Jacques Richard, and Bibiana Volker Martins and Laura Scherer, PhD students from UFRGS, Porto Alegre, whom I had previously met in Paris when they were on a sandwich scholarship.
Over the years, several other works of mine have been translated (Chanlat, 2000, 2010a), my articles have been published in the following journals: RAE, Organização e Sociedade, Gestão e Planejamento, Cadernos EBAPE. BR, GVexecutivo, and chapters have appeared in several other works (Bendassoli & Soboll, 2010/2021; Davel & Melo, 2005; Davel & Vergara, 2005). Finally, I was invited to co-coordinate two important works with my colleagues and friends, Roberto Fachin and Tânia Fischer – Andíse das organizações: perspectivas latinas. Vol. 1 e 2 (Analysis of organizations: Latin perspectives), which took a number of papers on the topic that were issued during a memorable conference that was held in July 2000 in Zacatecas, Mexico, organized by our Mexican colleagues and friends from the organizational studies area at UAM-Iztapalapa (Ramirez Martinez & Gonzáles-Miranda, 2018; Gonzáles-Miranda & Ramirez Martinez, 2018, 2020) and myself, and which had gathered for the occasion recognized colleagues coming from French-speaking countries (France, Belgium, Canada), Spanish-speaking countries (Mexico, Colombia, Argentina) and Brazilians (Chanlat, Fachin, & Fischer, 2006, 2007; Fachin, 2014).

As one can see, these numerous visits to Brazil enabled me to gradually familiarize myself with the country and acquire a clear view of the administrative sciences field, a Quebecois French view considering my own intellectual and professional path. Each time I observed how seriously French thought was taken, and how production in French about organizations, work and economics awakened an interest in the country.

**BRAZILIAN OPENNESS TO FRENCH THOUGHT: AN OLD STORY**

When I first arrived in Brazil I quickly noticed the influence that French thought had historically exerted and was still exerting on Brazilian society. I was particularly struck by the number of administrative science colleagues, who had mastered the French language, or who understood it without always being able to speak it.

According to certain Brazilian and foreign analysts, this French influence goes back to the 18th century, due to the thinking of French philosophers of the Enlightenment, and continued into the 19th century with the thoughts of Auguste Comte, a movement that was driven by Miguel de Lemos, Benjamin Constant Botelho de Magalhães and Raimundo Teixeira Mendes (Grange, 2000; Lins, 1967). I could also see some architectural vestiges of this school of thought in the first positivist church in Rio de Janeiro that was built in 1881, several years before the proclamation of the Republic. There is also an eloquent trace of this school in the official motto of Brazil, “Order and Progress”, which refers to a the maxim of Comte (Tyr, 2007). Comte’s philosophy was seen, then, as a source of political inspiration for those modernist elites who aspired to found a Republic and put an end to slavery, as Lorelai Kury points out in this regard:

> The positivist, republican and authoritarian political project was very influential in Brazil, and particularly powerful at the turn of the 20th century. In 1889 Auguste Comte’s disciples won a symbolic battle with regard to the Brazilian republican flag: the model, proposed by Raimundo Teixeira Mendes, added the motto “Order and Progress” to the former Imperial flag in order to establish a link between the past and the future, which closely followed the French philosopher’s instructions. Even though positivism throughout the 20th century lost the influence it had once had, this current of thought left its deep ideological marks on the country’s urban middle classes (Kury, 2003, p. 126). (Our translation.)

This French influence persisted in the 20th century. It is associated with the creation of the University of São Paulo (Universidade de São Paulo [USP]) in the 1930s, with which remarkable French personalities were associated,
such as geographers Pierre Monbeig and Pierre Deffontaines, historian Fernand Braudel, ethnologist Claude Lévi-Strauss, sociologist and anthropologist Roger Bastide, philosopher François Châtelet, historians Gérard Lebrun and Jean-Pierre Vernant, and epistemologist Gilles-Gaston Granger. It was also associated in a more general way with the strong influence that French philosophy, the major discipline in the country throughout the century, had.

As Sérgio Paulo Rouanet recalled it in the ‘Year of Brazil’ that was held in France in 2010:

> The French influence was so predominant that the history of welcoming French philosophical ideas became largely confounded with the history of philosophy in Brazil. To demonstrate this hegemony, we need only mention a recent book on philosophy teaching in the University of São Paulo (USP), one of the most respected institutions in Brazil, whose foundation was inspired by French professors. The author recalls this university’s Philosophy Department as being ‘a French overseas department’: that says it all (2010, p. 41).

(Our translation.).

That is how Bergson’s thinking, Maritain’s integral humanism, Mounier’s personalism, Lévi-Strauss’s structuralism, Sartre’s existentialism, and later, works by Castoriadis, Foucault, Derrida and Deleuze succeeded in line with the trends specific to each period, became highly popular with Brazilian intellectual elites. After the 1970s, it was combined with the enthusiasm that the Brazilian community then granted French social sciences, which was enjoying great international influence, and with the ties that great Brazilian intellectuals, like Fernando Henrique Cardoso, established with great French intellectual figures, notably with Alain Touraine (Kirschner & Gomes, 2014b). Brazil’s intellectual background, therefore, is clearly marked by these successive historical traces left by French thinking, even though other schools of thought, mainly those in English and German, have grown in importance in recent decades (Rouanet, 2010).

Due to this historical attraction that French culture had in the hearts of the elites (Fachin & Cavedon, 2003), a phenomenon that could also be seen in other Latin America countries (Bonnafoü, 1953), since the end of the 20th century this historical breeding ground has revealed itself to be favorable to being more open to production in French that focused on work, organizations and economics. This was favored by the fact that many Brazilian professors went to France to study for their PhDs, and later to Quebec, at a time when the Brazilian administrative sciences community was seeking alternatives to Anglo-Saxon thought that is predominant in this field of knowledge (Bertero, Caldas, & Wood, 1999; Cassundé, Barbosa & Mendonça, 2016; Fachin, 2014; Fachin & Cavedon, 2003; Fischer, 1985; Motta, 1990; Paula, Maranhão, Barreto, & Klechen, 2010; Torres & Gonçalves, 1991; Vergara, 2006; Waiandt, 2018).

**BRAZILIAN ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE RESEARCHERS SEEKING AN ALTERNATIVE TO ANGLO-SAXON HEGEMONY**

When we consult Brazilian works, particularly those that seek to summarize their field in social sciences (Bendassolli & Soboll, 2010/2020; Kirschner & Gomes, 2014a, 2014b) and administrative sciences (Bertero, 2006; Bertero, Alcadipani, Cabral, Faria, & Rossoni, 2013; Bertero, Caldas, & Wood, 2005), we observe that, despite the domination of Anglo-Saxon works, a lot of French works are mentioned in their reflections, particularly those from Brazilian researchers who are looking for an alternative to the domination of Anglo-American references (Fachin, 2014; Vergara, 2006; Vergara & Pinto, 2001; Waiandt, 2018).
In administrative science in Brazil, this Anglo-American hegemony goes back to the 1950s, when the US and Brazilian governments signed agreements to establish the first teaching programs and create the first higher education institutions in management in a cold war context, and with the help of Ford Foundation, which was heavily inspired by the American model of business academic education (Alcadipani & Bertero, 2012; Alcadipani & Bertero, 2014; Alcadipani & Caldas, 2012; Alcadipani & Cooke, 2013; Barros, Alcadipani & Bertero, 2018; Serva & Andion, 2021).

In Brazil this occurred in a much broader context of a society historically open to ideas coming from abroad, which Brazilians call “Estrangeirismo” (“foreignism”) (Bartel-Radic, 2013; Buarque de Holanda, 1936; 1998; Caldas & Wood, 1997; Freyre, 1963; Motta, Alcadipani, & Bresler, 2001), which is often pragmatically characterized as being a kind of “cannibalism” of foreign practices (Davel, Dantas, & Vergara, 2008).

Nowadays, according to certain colleagues (Bertero et al., 2013), the situation is as follows:

. . . The vast majority of studies in Administration in Brazil, particularly in areas like organizational studies and teaching and research, comprise theoretical essays that focus on European authors . . . . It seems that a large proportion of the academics in the field hates going into the field, and when they do, they produce texts using a weak and inconsistent methodology. Being aware of what is Brazilian is going to the Brazilian “reality”, studying the Brazilian “reality”, and getting to know the Brazilian “reality”, with references that will enable this reality to be expressed in all its complexity, rather than being hampered and hidden behind theories and models. We study Administration in Brazil very little. One of the reasons for our lack of originality is the fact that we look very little at our reality, at what happens in Brazil. But the parochialism of some sectors is compensated for by the “foreignism” of others . . . . We tend to overrate foreigners . . . . Valuing teaching and research from the North as being “first-class” is fundamental for constructing our inferiority as researchers. It implies leaving to them the role of creating models, which makes us mere imitators (p. 186). (Our translation.)

Based on this tough observation, they emphasize en passant the role played by the publication market:

More importantly, we need to bear in mind that much of the academic publication market, which is considered “international”, is controlled by Anglo-Saxon publishing houses and by Anglo-Saxon academics. If we take those that are considered to be the main journals in the area, they publish almost only articles on specific topics that are produced in specific universities. Publishing in an international journal involves serious academic work, but also involves questions of power. Today we see many scholars from different parts of the world looking for an Anglo-Saxon “broker” in order to have their articles published in these renowned journals. As a result, the superior foreigner is privileged and our condition of subordinate remains. Many foreigners really believe we are inferior (p. 186). (Our translation.)

For these same authors:

There is a hegemonic thinking in the field, which is mainly of North-American origins, that tends to ignore qualitative perspectives and more reflexive approaches. Being North Ameri-
can does not mean following this restricted and restrictive view of research in the field. There are North Americans who defend a more plural view, as there are Latin researchers who argue for a more restrictive view of research in the field. What we notice is an international shock between views (p. 193). (Our translation.)

It is in this historical context that some Brazilian researchers, therefore, sought to develop original thinking from the 1960s. This is the case of Guerreiro Ramos (1981/1989; 1983; Azevedo & Albernaz, 2006; de Paula, 2007; Serva, 1997a, 1997b; Serva & Andion, 2021), Mauricio Tragtenberg or Fernando Prestes Motta (Segnini & Alcadipani, 2014), the first of whom finds support particularly in Jacques Maritain's integral humanism and Emmanuel Mounier's personalism (Azevedo & Albernaz, 2006), while the latter two derive their support from other French intellectual traditions, particularly the anarchists (Motta, 1981, 1984, 1990, 2003; Tragtenberg, 2005, 2010, 2012), with all three Brazilian authors having a very significant influence in the country (Harzing, 2016). Other authors, like Fachin and Cavedon, at the end of their article about the influence of French thinking on Brazilian organizational studies, do not hesitate to stress their interest in these texts:

In the French-speaking world, therefore, we must seek the influx of academic production that, based on certain selective areas of knowledge, translates the critical French thinking that is so dear to Brazilian intellectuals from all sectors. The availability of such works in Portuguese undoubtedly represents a substantial addition to the reading possibilities of Brazilian scholars who did not do any of their graduate studies in France or Quebec (2003, p. 11). (Our translation.)

If the Brazilian field of administrative sciences, therefore, has been influenced by countless works in French, for the purposes of this article I decided to consider - but without ranking them - the three subjects that were, in my opinion, the sources of their inspiration, namely organization science, work science and heterodox economic science; This phenomenon was encouraged by the bilingualism of many Brazilian researchers, and by the translation of several reference works on these three subjects by Brazilian publishers.

The science of organizations

My first source of inspiration was the science of organizations, the result of works that were associated with the emergence of organizations as a social fact in the early 1960s (Caldas, Fachin, & Fischer, 1999; Clegg & Bayley, 2007; Clegg, Hardy & Nord, 1999; 2001, 2004; Chanlat & Séguin, 1987; Etzioni, 1967; Gonzáles-Miranda & Ramirez Martinez, 2020; Perrow, 1976; Séguin & Chanlat, 1983; Saussois, 2016).

In the French-speaking context, notably in France, this is translated by research that studied four important thematic axes: the psychology of organizations and institutional analysis; the sociology of organizations and companies; the anthropology of organizations; and the management of organizations.

recalled in their recent review (2019). These latter authors had an influence on the view that Brazilian researchers in administrative sciences built up of the relationship between psychic life and the organization, and helped inspire, along with many other French language researchers (Didier Anzieu, Serge Moscovici, Jean-Claude Rouchy, Guy and Jacqueline Palmade, André Green, Laurent Lapierre, etc.) the field of Brazilian critical organizational studies since the 1990s (Bendassolli & Soboll, 2011/2021; Freitas, 1999b; Freitas & Motta, 2005).

Another line of research that Brazilian researchers drew on concerns the sociology of organizations. This subject, which was founded in France by Michel Crozier at the beginning of the 1960s, later learned of an important development in French-speaking and Latin countries, driven by work carried out at the Center for the Sociology of Organizations (CSO), which was created and directed by Crozier (1963 a and b; 2000; Crozier & Friedberg, 1977; Entreprises et Histoire, 2016). This center later became the training home of most of the French-speaking pioneers in this subject (Chanlat, 1992 b, 1994; Saussois, 2016) and influenced certain Brazilian works, particularly in public administration (de Vasconcelos & Pinochet, 2004). It also benefited from work being done by the Laboratory of the Sociology of Change in Institutions (LSCI), which was created and directed by Renaud Sainsaulieu (1977/2014, 1990, 1997, 2002), one of the first of Crozier’s collaborators at CSO, and from studies by the Lyonnais Group of Industrial Sociology (GLYSI), which was created and directed by Philippe Bernoux (1985; Amblard, Bernoux, Herreros, & Livian, 1995). It is from the sociology of organizations that the sociology of business firm emerged in the 1990s (Bélanger & Lévesque, 1996; Dupuis & Kuzminski, 1998; Sainsaulieu, 1990; Sainsaulieu & Segrestin, 1987; Segrestin, 1992), which played a very important role in Brazil in the early 2000s (Kirschner & Gomes, 2014a; Sainsaulieu & Kirschner, 2006).

From the beginning of the 1990s, another group of works achieved great popularity in the field of Brazilian administrative sciences, works that were associated with my own anthropological perspective. They can be found in the three volumes of the Brazilian translation of the work that I directed: L’individu dans l’organisation: les dimensions oubliées [The individual in the organization: the forgotten dimensions]. In two other translated works (Chanlat, 2000, 2010), one by Ofelia Torres (Chanlat, 2000), and the other published by Isabel de Vasconcelos in her Cengage learning serie “Debates em Administração” (‘Debates in Management’) (Chanlat, 2010), and in numerous other publications (Serva & Andion, 2021). As stressed by Ofélia Torres and Marílson Alves Gonçalves (1991) in their review of the work, in 1991:

L’Individu dans l’Organisation: les dimensions oubliées [The Individual in the Organization – the forgotten dimensions] masterfully transmits the message of renewing the knowledge and practice of behavioral science in the business world. Based on a general reflection on the development of an anthropology of the human condition in organizations, each author develops their contribution from a particular perspective. From language to space, including the symbolic universe, time, psychic life, otherness and psychopathology, the work achieves its proposed objective, that is, to establish a common view of human beings, recognizing the importance of their role in each dimension, without, however, curtailing the shock of ideas and styles and the freedom to disagree with methods and approaches around the common theme . . . . This publication opens new perspectives, and is of interest to professors, researchers and students alike, particularly Master’s degree and PhD students, who are numerous today in Brazil, because it can serve as a reference when it comes to writing monographs and theses in this new field of knowledge. Because of its reflexive and practical content about human beings in organizations as subject, actor, living and concrete person, it will also be of interest to company executives and HR managers (p.107-108). (Our translation.)
In other words, this perspective encourages Brazilian researchers to become interested in the different dimensions set out in the work by numerous French-speaking colleagues, thanks to its Brazilian edition (Fachin & Cavedon, 2003; Torres & Gonçalves 1992; Vergara, 2006), and to the fact that these studies have been “Brazilianized” (Chanlat et al., 2006). This perspective being not ethnocentric; these works will also inspire certain Brazilian reflections about the epistemology of administrative sciences (Serva & Andion, 2021).

Finally, some works on management sciences also raised notable interest in the Brazilian community. We can mention, among others, Omar Aktoul’s work of critical synthesis on management, in the wake of studies conducted at the time at HEC-Montreal (Chanlat & Dufour, 1985; Chanlat, 1990), the Portuguese translation of which was widely known in Brazil (1996); some works from the École Polytechnique’s CRG in Paris (Berry, 1983, 2019), particularly one by Jacques Girin (2016) about language and management situations (Bayard, Bosqueix, & Dumez, 2010), and by Hervé Dumez (2016) about qualitative methodologies; and work by Audet and Malouin (1986), and Audet and Déry (1996) in Quebec, and by Martinet (1990) and Pesqueux in France on the epistemology of management sciences (Martinet & Pesqueux, 2013; Serva, 2013, 2017 a et b), and by Pesqueux on philosophy and organizations (2008). It is also worth mentioning the work by Thévenet (1992) on corporate culture, and the pioneering work by Philippe d’Iribarne and his team, “Gestion et Société” [Management and Society] about national culture (d’Iribarne, Chevrier, Henry, Segal, & Tréguer-Felten, 2020; d’Iribarne, Henry, Henry, Segal, Chevrier, & Globokar, 2009); works by Jean-Pierre Dupuis, Serge Bouchard and Omar Aktouf about culture and organizational symbolism (Freitas, 1991; 1999a); and works by Laurent Lapierre about leadership (1989, 2005), notably presented in Chanlat (1992, 1994, 1996), and also the works by Romain Laufer (1977) on the legitimacy crisis in organizations (Laufer & Paradeise, 1982; Motta, 1988).

We can also mention the more recent works of the École des Mines, notably by Segrestin and Hatchuel (2012) about a redefinition of the company. These two authors were responsible for arousing a certain enthusiasm among several Brazilian researchers who were interested in the management of solidarity organizations (Eynaud & França, 2019) and in contributing to a legal redefinition of companies in France (Hatchuel, 2021), a topic, which is also seen as a key issue for some English-speaking colleagues (Clarke, O’Brien and O’Kelley, 2019). There are also works produced for over ten years (2008-2018) by “Chaire Management, diversité et cohésion sociale”, of the Paris-Dauphine University, by Stéphanie Dameron, Mustafa Özbilgin and by the author of this article (Chanlat et al., 2013; Chanlat & Özbilgin, 2018, 2019). These works and the two international symposia that were organized in Paris in 2011 and 2015, with the participation of Maria Ester de Freitas and Marcelo Dantas, had a great repercussion in Brazil thanks to the contacts established at the time with other researchers. Since then, a new sphere of research has emerged in the administrative sciences in interculturality (Davel, Dupuis, & Chanlat, 2008) and diversity that sought a better understanding, specially of expatriation experiences and reducing inequality and discrimination in Brazilian organizations (Bueno & Freitas, 2016; Freitas, 2018; Freitas et Dantas, 2011; Freitas & Dantas, 2014).

We can finally mention recent fundamental works in accounting written by Alexandre Rambaud and Jacques Richard, who question the very foundations of the discipline with a view to reformulating our economic system, which should ultimately be of interest to Brazilian researchers who are looking for an ecological management model because of the ties that Jacques Richard established with certain of them (Rambaud & Richard, 2021) and David, Hatchuel and Laufer ‘ new building reflections on Administrative sciences (2012). At last there are, of course, numerous works in French-speaking scientific networks, such as RIODD that deals with company responsibility and sustainable development, AGRH (Human Resource Management), AIMS (Strategic Management and Organization), RHIME (Ethics and Interdisciplinarity) and ATLAS-AFMI (International management), which French-speaking Brazilian researchers can access via the Internet and participate in, as some have sometimes done in recent years. Finally,
researchers can consult various journals that will give them access to often original works, such as Revue Française de Gestion, Gérer et Comprendre, Gestion, Management International, Management et Avenir, Finance, Contrôle, Stratégie, M@n@gement, Rhime, le Libellio d’Aegis, Entreprise et Société, Revue internationale PME, Gestion 2000, La Revue des Sciences de Gestion, Management et Sciences Sociales, Revue de l’organisation responsable, Question(s) de management, Entreprises et histoire... and consult the Société Française de Management website to read its reviews, its opinions and publications on current matters in our area.

Work Sciences

Work Sciences are a second source of inspiration. The work by Christophe Dejours (2007, 2011, 2015, 2017) occupies a centrally historical place in Brazil (Dejours, Abdoucheli, & Jayet, 1994). Since the 1990s his psycho-dynamic perspective of work has, in fact, been a significant source of inspiration for Brazilian research into the psychology of work (Aerosa, 2019; Bendassolli & Borges-Andrade, 2015; Bendassolli & Soboll, 2010/2021; Betiol & Tonelli, 2002; Cicero, Cardoso, & Klpan, 2019; Lima, 1998; Sznelwar, Uchida, & Lancman, 2011), a fact that was emphasized in 2009 by Álvaro Roberto Crespo Merlo and Ana Magnólia Bezerra Mendes (2009) in an inventory of work psychodynamics in Brazil:

The launch in Brazil in 1987 of the A loucura do trabalho [Psychopathology of Work] by Christophe Dejours, with the new theoretical contribution of the work, turned it into a reference text that was used by almost all researchers in the area. The discussion and approach in this book were new, provided many answers, and opened the way for thinking about the consequences of work – particularly the way it is organized – on the psychic health of workers (p. 142). (Our translation.)

Later the authors added:

The approach adopted in this subject enabled the reductionist view to be surpassed, a view that held only the individual accountable for the consequences of work on their health, and sought specific work experiences that occurred in real work realities, such as, for example, the role played by worker intelligence and its function as a defense mechanism and in the construction of identity at work (2009, p. 143). (Our translation.)

Because it is based on practice, this approach also exerted a notable influence on the administrative sciences, thanks to the researchers who were interested in the relationship between psychology and organization (Fachin & Cavedon, 2003; Freitas, 2008 a; Freitas & Motta, 2000; Vergara, 2006), sometimes via the chapter he had written in my main work (Dejours, 1996).

Other publications about work sciences also awoke interest. Here we can recall those by Pascale Molinier (2013) about service and care jobs (Gaviria & Molinier, 2011), for a long time close to Dejours; works by Yves Clot (2010) and Dominique Lhuillier, who were responsible for developing a work activity clinic inspired by Vygotsky and Bakthine (Bendassolli & Soboll, 2011/2021; Clot & Lhuillier, 2006, 2010; Lima, 2013); and the pioneering works on ergonomics led by Alain Wisner, the founder of the French Ergonomics School (Sznelwar, 2006). Finally, certain writings on the sociology of work also had some repercussions, in particular the theory of social regulation by Jean-Daniel Reynaud (1989), one of the main reference in the French-speaking area (Terssac, 2003) who enjoyed some
success with his colleagues in administrative sciences in Brazil, particularly Marlene Catarina Oliveira Lopes Melo (1984) who, having written her thesis under Reynaud in Paris, used his reflection to understand the role played by conflict management at work, an observation we can also make with regard to her French language colleagues (Richebé et al., 2020). Finally, we can mention the works by Norbert Alter on innovation (2002) and cooperation (2010), which have also been remarked upon by the Brazilian community (Salvador, 2011).

**The heterodox economic sciences**

The third source of inspiration for Brazilian researchers in administrative sciences is the heterodox economic sciences (Lévesque, Bourque, & Forgues, 1997). In fact, all those interested in socio-economic equilibrium, social development, and social economy organizations in a country where there are deep social inequalities (Ferreira de Souza, 2018; Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística, 2019) found elements in certain currents of French heterodox economic thinking that were capable of enriching their own reflections on Brazilian realities.

Among these currents of thought, we find those that deal with regulation theory: Boyer, Freyssenet, Aglietta, Coriat, Lipietz, Orléan... (Aglietta, 1997; Boyer & Cohen, 2010; Coriat, 1994; Mello, 2019), which is well known in Latin America (Castaints-Teillery, 2014; de Mello Filho, 2019), and with the economics of convention (Boltanski & Chiapello, 1999; Boltanski & Thévenot, 1991; Eymard-Duvernay, 2004; Favereau, 1989; Orléan, 2004; Salais et Thévenot, 1986), an analysis of conventions that is a theory of collective action that seeks to overcome the contradictions of rational choice theory (Bessy & Favereau, 2003).

The works of this last current, particularly those by Boltanski and Thévenot (1991) on economies by of Grandeurs, turn the spotlight on the situation in which collective action occurs. It is constituted, according to the authors, by processes of justification and proof, and from this process emerges a plurality of meanings about what is just across several models of “worlds” (market, domestic, industrial, civic, of opinion, and of inspiration), without an external or determined hierarchy existing among them. The existence of these many conventions, therefore, makes it possible to produce a critique of a purely market view of action. These works, joining a certain number of Brazilian researchers reflections on substantive rationality in the footsteps of the Guerirero Ramos pioneering work done in Brazil, are going to have some resonance among them (Serva, Caitano, Santos, & Siqueira, 2015).

Since social economics is an important area in Brazil, the works carried out in the French-speaking world on this subject also aroused great interest in Brazilian researchers, and Brazilian works were welcomed with great interest in France and Quebec (Laville, 2011). Since solidarity economy organizations had not shown much interest in the theory of organizations (Serva, 2002; Serva et Andion, 2006), it is not surprising, therefore, that some Brazilian researchers again seek their inspiration from this school of economic sociology, while making their own original contributions (Andion, 1998, 2005; França, Laville, Medeiros, & Magnen, 2005; Martes, Loureiro, Abramovay & Serafim, 2007; Sperb et Serva, 2018). The international conferences on local power held in Bahia by NEPOL, which is known today as CIAGS, and coordinated by Tânia Fischer, favored their spread.

The recent work by Philippe Eynaud and Genauto Carvalho de França Filho– a CIAGS member-Solidarité et organisation: penser une autre gestion [Solidarity and organization: thinking of another management], published both in France (2019) and in Brazil (2020) is, in its own way, a testimony of this exemplary Franco-Brazilian cooperation on this subject that is fundamental both for management and our socio-economic and environmental future. They emphasize both the potential and the paradoxes as follows:
... Faced with these threatening dangers, one single solution . . . , however, can be invoked: solidarity. The defense of solidarity between human beings and Nature (understood as all living beings: animals and plants) is, in fact, the most direct way of responding to the challenges of climate change and the loss of biodiversity. The development of solidarity among human beings is also a perennial response to the inequalities that divide them. But while saying what our response should be is easy, its execution is particularly difficult. We are faced with countless obstacles, among them – and not the least – the lack of reflection on usable concepts for organizing this solidarity as close as possible to the actors and their economic activities. There is, in fact, a paradox that needs to be highlighted: it has never been more necessary to implement solidarity both nationally and internationally, and reflecting on it has never been so avoided, misunderstood or discredited (p. 5). (Our translation.)

**BETWEEN LOCALISM AND OPENNESS: IS THE BRAZILIAN FIELD SEEKING ITS SINGULARITY IN THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT?**

The field of Brazilian administrative science has always known foreign influences, as we have just seen, which is not surprising in the scientific world that is traditionally marked by the circulation of ideas. Though this exchange can prove to be very fertile, some situations may be problematic when a particular field suffers from strongly dominant force, thus preventing it from developing at its own pace and in accordance with its own issues. Such is the case today in numerous national fields that are coming under increasing pressure to comply with the so-called “international” rules and logics that come from the heart of the North-American world. This phenomenon, however, is not only experienced in countries situated in the South; it equally affects numerous other countries worldwide, including English-speaking countries (Clegg & Bayley, 2007; Dameron & Durand, 2017; Willmott, 2011).

The universe of teaching and research in management is characterized, among other aspects, by annual national and international rankings of institutions (Shanghai, Times, Financial Times, etc.), which are based on the international accreditations obtained (AACSB, EQUIS, AMBA), the number of publications by teaching personnel that appear in classified journals, the most cited always being American, and of course, the growing hegemony of the English language in the field that this implies (Chanlat, 2014 a, b, c; Collectif, 2019; Dameron & Durand, 2017; Lussier & Chanlat, 2017; Nygaard, 2019; Tietze & Dick, 2012; Tsuda, 2013). As these bibliometric classifications are increasingly criticized (Berry, 2009; Lussier et Chanlat, 2017; Willmott, 2011; Tourish & Willmott, 2015), some institutions have had no hesitation in abandoning them, such as occurred recently in France with the Management and Economics section of CNRS (the French most important scientific research center), which suppressed its classification once and for all.

Despite everything, for non-English-speaking countries, this tension remains strong, making them oscillate between a full adoption of the so-called “international” rules, which is often confused with “everything in English”, and that leads, therefore, to a growing Anglicization of minds (Boussebaa & Tienari, 2019; Chanlat, 2014a; Collectif, 2019; Jackson & Primecz, 2019; Lussier & Chanlat, 2017; Nygaard, 2019; Tietze & Dick, 2012; Tsuda, 2013), and a resistance strategy that aims to remain relevant to their local, regional and national environment, while avoiding closing in on themselves.
In the case of Latin American countries, and particularly Brazil, these issues are, as we have seen, a recurring object of countless debates in the scientific community (Alcadipani & Caldas, 2012; Alcadipani & Faria, 2014; Bertero, Caldas, & Wood, 1999; Guedes et Faria, 2010; Ibarra-Colado, Faria & Guedes, 2010; Ibarra-Colado, 2006; Paula et al., 2010; Serva, 2017). Given the current situation, while some seem to succumb to the dominant rules, others however try to offer some resistance. In Brazil, this resistance involves criticism of the dominant logics (Bertero et al., 2013; Fischer, Waiandt, & Fonseca, 2011) of classification systems (Fischer, 2018; Serva, 2017), of the “everything English” policy in terms of publications (Alves & Pozzebon, 2013; Gantman, Yousfi, & Alcadipani, 2015), and the affirmation of their singularities (Motta, 1983, 2002; Motta & Caldas, 1997; Fachin, 2006, 2014; Davel, Vergara & Ghadiri, 2007; Waiandt, 2009, 2018) and the questioning of works produced based on a critical post-colonial reflection and from a deeply unequal social context (Alcadipani, 2010b; Alcadipani & Faria, 2014; Alcadipani & Rosa, 2011; Gantman et al., 2015; Ferreira de Souza, 2018; IBGE, 2020).

These critiques, in fact, advocate a review of the system as a whole:

. . . Therefore, faced with the imperial power of the re-Westernization and the obligation to assume more substantive geo-epistemic responsibilities, one of the main challenges for the coming decades in Brazil is to rebuild or reform our current institutions (Anpad, Capes, CNPq etc.) . . . Thus the Management area in Brazil will be able to lead transformations of the same order as institutions abroad (US Academy of Management, Chinese Academy of Management, World Bank, Egos etc.) by means of a large project that includes a geopolitics of knowledge, promotes the substitution of Eurocentric universalism for a pluriversalíty, and enables the construction of a world, in which different worlds and knowledge can coexist. Maybe it is too much to ask or hope for from the Management area, but it can be an excellent opportunity for us to reinvent the area (Bertero et al., 2013, p. 190). (Our translation.)

This constitutes a warning against a purely bibliometric assessment of research, the lion’s share of which is published in English, which contributes towards reducing creativity:

We must be careful not to let the values and metrics that regulate us become the intellectual castration we don’t deserve, and that puts an end to our creative and innovative efforts. So, the main question is: what impact does my management have on people, territories, and organizations? It needs to be assessed in relation to its impact, and by what it adds, in order to avoid the almost autism we find in people who become isolated when they are only guided by metrics. In fact, these metrics may not be valid in a few years’ time. We must be sensitive now to this issue, which could permit to a reposition of our scientific field in the right direction (Fischer, 2018, p. 26). (Our translation.)

The regulatory agency in Brazil, CAPES, instituted its own ranking of journals that is known as Qualis. It is the main point of reference for assessing Graduate Programs, based on publications of the Program’s faculty in the best-positioned journals in the ranking. The architecture of the Qualis valuation reflects the range of indices and the impact factors of the scientific associations mentioned above. In the Administration area, at the top classification level of Qualis (A1), no Brazilian journal appears; most of them are American journals, with the English language being totally predominant (Serva, 2017b, p. 55). (Our translation.)
Finally, this criticism reaffirms the importance of dialogue with other fields of knowledge, and reinforces international cooperation with a view to withstanding the huge challenges faced by our societies and our planet (Alcadipani & Faria, 2018; Chanlat, Fachin, & Fischer, 2006, 2007; Eynaud & França, 2019, 2020). For us, dialogue between French-speaking researchers and Brazilian researchers should continue to occur within this framework.

It is in this context, as we have seen, that works in French have found some support from the Brazilian community for some decades, particularly by way of some outstanding works and lines. This interest is based on historical value and a Latin cultural proximity, which, despite the differences there may be between Latin peoples, in my own specific case, French and Brazilians, still exists despite everything (Pinot de Villechenon, 2003; Pinot de Villechenon, Chanlat, & Rizzo, 2021; Rouquié, 1987).

This dialogue, in my opinion, can only last, however, if French language researchers and Brazilian researchers keep on defending their specialties by writing books, articles, and monographs in their native language, and organizing conferences and seminars where issues of their own societies are always addressed (Chanlat, 2014a, 2014b). Researchers should continue to concentrate on their socio-economic environment in a relevant way (Fischer, 2018). Therefore, we need to avoid finding ourselves in the situation of that Norwegian researcher who confessed he was incapable of presenting the results of his studies to his fellow citizens in Norwegian, because of the “everything in English” policy implemented by his institution, which had resulted in him losing his ability to do so [present in Norwegian] (Niggard, 2019).

On my part, as I have just said, I have always tried to be an author that affirms local, regional and national singularities in all the areas in which I have intervened (teaching, research, publications, national and international scientific associations), always promoting a true intercultural dialogue (Chanlat, 2014b; Chanlat, Davel, & Dupuis, 2013; Chanlat & Pierre, 2018; Davel, Dupuis & Chanlat, 2008) between linguistic worlds, and remaining attentive to this bond with the Brazilian community that is dear to me for the reasons I have previously mentioned, a community that has, in my opinion, despite the previous criticisms, all the elements necessary for a scientific field that aspires to relative autonomy: demographic number, journals, publishing houses, scientific associations, conferences, etc. (Chanlat, 2015). It was precisely for this reason that, as much as I could, I encouraged numerous colleagues, particularly French speakers, to participate in events in Brazil, and numerous Brazilian colleagues to participate in French language events. I also tried to publicize some of their works in French, including in the collection I direct at Laval University publishing house (Cavalcanti, 2011).

This spirit of openness is based, among other things, on multilingualism and an active policy in terms of translation that allow us access to foreign thinking (Helsinki, initiative, 2019). This is often not the case with our American colleagues, whose monolingualism and the few translations of our reference works in English that are available to them very often result in them becoming academically provincial, as Gaylord Georges Candler (2014) reminds us with regard to the reception of the thinking of Guerreiro Ramos in the United States. This provincialism, of course, is not exclusive to our American colleagues. Brazilian researchers who often master several languages are, therefore, well-placed to avoid this trap if this multilingualism is used to develop original works about their reality, knowingly dialoguing with other linguistic worlds in full knowledge of the cause (Bertero et al., 2013; Chanlat, 2014a, 2015; Clegg & Bayley, 2007), and so materializing Guerreiro Ramos's (1981/1989) thought: “Only through the free experience of reality and its precise articulation can substantive rationality be understood”.

I would like to conclude this article in this special issue of RAÉ with the wish that relations between Brazilian and French-speaking researchers be maintained and developed through benevolent reciprocity, as Guerreiro Ramos wanted (1984). This will occur through works being regularly published in our different journals and by our several
publishing houses, and of course in this multilingual journal, *RAE*, that has become a journalistic benchmark (*Tonelli, 2018*), and to which I offer my sincere wishes as it continues on this formidable adventure that started sixty years ago. Sixty years is, in fact, an unforgettable anniversary for a scientific journal in administrative sciences. *

* In comparison, the American journal, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, was founded in 1956, only five years before.
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