
Editorial

Bill Cooke¹

Alex Faria²

Development, Management and North Atlantic Imperialism: For Eduardo Ibarra Colado

Tell me brother, what's the word, tell me brother, have you heard, from Johannesburg? Sister, woman, what's the word, tell me have you heard, from Johannesburg? (Gil Scott Heron, Johannesburg, recorded 1976)

The US is an Empire run on behalf of multinational companies and the ruling class of America... [Barack Obama is]... the gatekeeper for white monopoly capital (Bongani Masuku, Confederation of South African Trades Unions, 2013)

The purpose of [the US Academy of Management, Johannesburg] conference is to bring Africa's unique capabilities and needs to the attention of the world's organization and management scholars [.. and...] to collaborate and work on the many interesting theoretical and practice problems presented in Africa [US-AOM website, 2013]

Introduction

This special issue was engendered in 2012, to build on other initiatives scrutinizing 'development' and 'management' nexus. We had two concerns – to address this nexus per se; and in so doing to contest the extending representational reach of the North-Atlantic management academy over the world (e.g., DAR and COOKE, 2008; WANDERLEY and FARIA, 2012; BERTERO, ALCADIPANI, CABRAL et al., 2013; ALCADIPANI and CALDAS, 2012). As we go on to suggest, these two motives are themselves inextricably intertwined.

Our Call for Papers proposed a threefold configuration of the relationship:

(i) Development-Management: The longstanding and overlooked relation between management and development; how development interventions are managed, in so called "developing countries," and articulated in so called "developed nations" or "advanced economies"... But also we stress the need to consider [t]ypes of management(s) mobilized by emerging economies in South-South designs of development(s).

(ii) Development&Management: The takeover of development by management and business...including the Bottom of the Pyramid...the role of think tanks, foundations, consultancies, business schools, and First-World scholarly associations in the sustaining and/or emancipation of the peripheral.

¹ PhD by University of Manchester; Professor and Head of the Department of Organisation, Work and Technology at Lancaster University Management School. E-mail: b.cooke@lancs.ac.uk

² PhD in Industrial and Business Studies by University of Warwick, UK; Deputy Professor at Fundação Getúlio Vargas. Address: FGV/EBAPE - Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública e de Empresas, 190 Praia de Botafogo – 4th and 5th floor, Botafogo, Zip code: 22253-900, Rio de Janeiro - RJ, Brazil. E-mail: alex.faria@fgv.br

(iii) Development/Management The fissure/cracks between and within development-management and development&management. The relation between the two fields, in practice, disciplinarily, and theoretically...

Before we summarize our authors' unique contribution to these variations of the nexus, we first, take the opportunity to explicate the distinctions and overlaps between them. This we initiate through a consideration of the second of our concerns, the over-reaching of the North Atlantic academy. We name that element of the academy such, first, in tribute to anthropologist, the late Michel-Rolph Trouillot's recognition that the colonial Atlantic encounter between Europe, the Americas, and Africa was *constitutive* of modernity. Second, because empirically the countries of the NATO military alliance dominate, still, the institutions and production of management knowledge. We are not original in this. We follow Locke's history of management institutions (1996) that speaks of a "NATO era", of their expansion in support of US foreign policy; Burrell (1997) who situates the emergence of modern organization in trans-Atlanticist migrations of the European peasantry; and Murphy and Zhu (2012) who map (literally) *Anglo-American domination in management journals*, as their title states.

Turning Back the North Atlantic

The proposal for this Special Issue was put to Ana Guedes, the then Editor of *Cadernos EBAPE.BR*, an open-access online journal published in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Our desire to work with this journal in itself was a geo-political objection to North-Atlanticism. *Cadernos EBAPE.BR* is outside the exclusive, and exclusively North-Atlantic, Anglophone journal rankings by which North Atlantic management academics chose to live and die, and which, tragically, many institutions in the South have chosen to follow. A dire consequence is that an extraordinary number of academics, part-time-, and non- academics who chose not to write in English are impeded and degraded, (see ROSA and ALVES, 2012). They may wish to express ideas articulable only in (say) Portuguese or Spanish, or to use the genre norms of their own writing traditions. They may, too, want to make their work accessible to the hundreds of millions of their fellow country-people who are blessed and cursed by a lack of the English language, and whose societies are paying for it in the first place.

'Internationally,' then, *Cadernos EBAPE.BR* is not highly ranked or cited. But the North Atlantic notion of the 'international' journal means, by tautological definition, 'must be published in English, in the US or Europe, and ranked by North Atlantic ranking businesses.' *Cadernos EBAPE.BR*'s 'poor' – to the point of non-existent - ranking is despite its importance for the field of management and organization studies in Brazil and other countries in Latin America according to citations, and Brazil's own rankings (see FARIA, 2011). Contributions to this journal can be Brazil specific; they can be Latin America specific; but they are also contributions to the theories of management and organization studies, as the term is understood in the North Atlantic sphere. It publishes articles in (at least) three languages. It is widely read across nations, particularly in Latin America and Lusophonia. It is therefore, by any sense of the word international, except, of course, the North Atlanticists' perversion of it.

Development-Management

To reiterate, then, the development-management formulation signifies here the longstanding yet obscure(d) relationship between the two fields. There has been, almost since the start of Truman's point IV Development endeavor, some intertwining of management (then also institutionally framed as 'administration') with development interventions. Hence the school in which *Cadernos EBAPE.BR* is located, and from which it takes its name, was founded in 1952, with support from US-AID and the Ford Foundation (see Barros and Carrieri in this issue) as "EBAP," that is *Escola Brasileira de Administração*

Pública [The Brazilian School for Public Administration] The final ‘E’ - for ‘*e de Empresas*’ [and Companies] was added 50 years later, in 2002. More recently, sociologically informed critical scholars of management have addressed this relationship (DAR and COOKE, 2007; WANDERLEY and FARIA, 2012; MURPHY, 2008); and this Special Issue builds on this more recent corpus. As we will go on to show, there was quite a lot in between. However, throughout the history of the development – management engagement, until very recently we are clear that it has been a marginal(ized) concern. This is ironic, given the magnificent aspirations of international development.

Where this modernist, modernizing, hubris of the international development project is acknowledged, and the complicity of managerialism debated, is in the work of critical social scientists working in and through development studies (DAR and COOKE, 2008). Again, the North Atlantic’s ‘international’ business and management journal rankings downgrade development studies journals, even those in English, whose citation data are actually much ‘stronger’ than those of the managerial establishment. Thus, the infamous Association of Business Schools List ‘rigorously’ ranks ‘every’ journal in which business school faculty might publish. And what the ABS finds, rigorously, is that there are no “World Class” development studies journals. The British Journal of Management is World Class, but intellectually lesser are *World Development*, *Development and Change*, and any other international development journal.

This dismissal of international development scholarship *in toto* is a vivid demonstration of the knowledge power of North Atlantic managerialism, and part of the panoply of serious, and heavily policed, obstacles to dialogues and engagements between social scientists’ understandings of management in society, and those of international development. We therefore thank Cadernos EBAPE.BR for accepting our proposal. We also thank Editor Guedes, and her successors, for insisting that as well as being online and free, contributions must be published in both Portuguese and English. This has imposed administrative and resource requirements on the journal. Unlike our for-super-profit, and profitable tax-havened (HARVIE, LIGHTFOOT, LILLEY et al, 2012) North Atlantic rivals, we recognize that “as most of the Brazilian thought in management and organizations is produced in Portuguese, it is not even readable by the North” (ALCADIPANI, KHAN, GANTMAN et al, 2012, p. 135). Furthermore, that we did receive many high quality submissions from Brazil, that their submission was in Portuguese, and that their particular orientation is post-extra-supra-Atlanticist evidences a subalternized tradition of development and management scholarship.

A significant exemplar of this can be seen through the keynote commentary we publish here. Early in our design of this Special Issue, we were delighted to gain the special attention and support of Paulo Motta, former Dean of EBAPE. His 1972 article *Administração para o Desenvolvimento: A disciplina em busca da relevância* (Administration for Development: The Discipline in Search of Relevance), published in EBAP’s *Revista de Administração Pública*, is seminal in Brazil and Latin America. In this paper, Motta initially called for the creation of “administration for development” not as a generic field, but in/from Brazil, and defined in Brazilian terms and contexts. This proposition was then extended to make what might now be called a South-South connection between development and (public) administration in Brazil, and in other countries in the global South. EBAP, as it then was, was of high standing, and had important relationships beyond Brazil. According to Motta, wherever enacted *Administração para o Desenvolvimento* had to have local foundations, rather than simply mimic the prescriptions of the North. This is, still, a challenge to the Northern international development administration and management orthodoxy. It is, too, unsettlingly, to those from critical management studies (CMS), who, following post-Development thinkers (e.g. ESCOBAR 1996; DAR and COOKE 2008) see the development discourse as a wholly North Atlantic imposition (at the risk of caricature). We are therefore delighted and honored to follow this editorial with a keynote commentary revisiting and reviving the 1972 theses from Paulo Motta, co-authored with Valentina Schmitt (one of the many Brazilian PhDs supervised by him over the last forty-odd years).

More, recently, connecting with post-development critiques of international development, some CMS writers reframe ostensibly neutralist, a-spatial managerialist orthodoxies as *de facto imperial management and organization studies*, without inhibition in its claims to ‘relevance’ for the rest of the non-North Atlantic world (see CALÁS and SMIRCICH, 2013), nor shame for its travesties there (see below). Some account for this management - development intertwining through the Cold War, (e.g. ALCADIPANI and COOKE 2013; BARROS and CARRIERE in this issue); others show how the subalternization continues in the present (e.g., IBARRA-COLADO, 2006; MURPHY 2008; GUEDES and FARIA, 2010; COOKE, 2010; ALCADIPANI, KHAN, GANTMAN et al, 2012). In this century, US post 9/11 unilateralism has downgraded the neoliberal globalist discourses of world peace, free markets, and interdependence. More prominent now is the North Atlantic’s leveraging of security and war on terror discourses to legitimize the return to a more blatant imperial globalism (STEGGER, 2009). Robert Kaplan, an award-winning and influential Pentagon insider, has been explicit that free markets cannot spread without military power, and that military questions can no longer be treated as separate from economic matters and vice versa. He writes – not reluctantly at all – in “Supremacy by Stealth: Ten Rules for Managing the World” (2003, p. 11):

The purpose of power is not power itself; it is a fundamentally liberal purpose of sustaining the key characteristics of an orderly world. Those characteristics include basic political stability, the idea of liberty, pragmatically conceived; respect for property; economic freedom; and representative government, culturally understood. At this moment in time it is American power, and American power only, that can serve as an organizing principle for the worldwide expansion of liberal civil society.”

From the what were thought to be the graves of empire return interventions grounded in the North Atlanticist militarization of economics and politics in general, and of development practices in particular. The espoused purpose is Western security; the actuality is North Atlanticist economic extraction and rule. The revelations that the US-National Security Agency’s global surveillance program pays more attention to Brazil than any other country in Latin America, including Cuba, more than Libya or Algeria, and as much as Russia, can only be understood in this way (GREENWALD and MCASKILL, 2013). In terms of the war on terror, and threats to US homeland security, Brazil is utterly benign. Until, that is, one considers it as an economic threat – a material and (more or less) ideological challenge to North Atlantic armed neo-liberalism (GLOSNY, 2010).

From Development-Management to Development&Management

So, following the development management nexus is revealing not just of the past, or even of lessons for the present in the past. Rather, it exposes the existence of imperial resource-lodes, taking a variety of material and cultural forms, laid down over centuries, but constantly replenished, to be deployed wherever and whenever North Atlantic interests have a present need. Of course, our logic would have been wrong had North Atlantic managerial establishment acknowledged this state of things, despite its espoused interest in international management, international business, and international-national cultures. Outwith CMS, there is, though, a relatively new and overt managerialist focus on the ‘problems’ of global poverty and development, most notably associated with the concept of the Bottom (or Base) of the Pyramid (BOP) (PRAHALAD, 2009). However, this baseist-bottomism is based in a determined a-historicism, where North Atlantic management’s earlier, usually destructive, engagements with development are deeply buried. A particular example is post-independence President of Tanzania Julius Nyerere famed ‘ujamaa vijijini’ principles of local, village based, rural development of the late 1960s and 1970s (oddly enough, ujaama sometimes just gets translated as ‘socialism’, e.g. by Wikipedia). The spectacular failure of this and Nyerere’s other apparent attempts at African Socialism led US-right wing commentators like Charles Lane to state:

former Tanzanian dictator, Julius Nyerere, was single-handedly responsible for the economic destruction of his potentially wealthy nation”(1999, p. 16; cited by IBHAWOH and DIBUA, 2003)

In fact, whatever he was, and whatever happened, Nyerere was not single-handed. He had big help, in the form of the apogee of North Atlanticist managerialism, McKinsey & Co. Max’s 1991 anodyne primer on Tanzanian Local Government, puts it thus:

Prior to the launching of the new decentralized local government system, the government sought the services of McKinsey & Co, Inc., an international capitalist consultancy firm specialized in development management. The firm was commissioned to work out the modalities and operational arrangements of the new system (1991, p. 84).

Resnick (1996) calls this McKinsey’s *coup de grace* for Tanzania, the culmination of a series of destructive interventions in the State Trading Corporation, government purchasing, education and health provision. Moreover, we would add here that McKinsey’s work then, as its ongoing work now (so it was not actually a culmination for McKinsey) was funded by loans to government of Tanzania from multi-lateral and bi-lateral institutions, that are then bundled into its national debt, ensuring Tanzania remains a ‘highly indebted poor country’, its base of the pyramid citizenry servicing the debt at a rate of approximately 35-45% of GDP; depending on source (eg MAGOMBA 2013; see also COOKE 2004 for a description of debt rolling up). Max’s use of “capitalist” is in context clearly non-pejorative. It is just his description of what McKinsey was. This in turn supports Ibhawoh and Dibua’s (2003) larger point, consistent with post-development thinkers, that the development paradigm was actually transcendent of socialist-capitalist distinctions (summarized in DAR and COOK, 2008). Of course, one will not find any of the new development&management BOP literature amongst Ibhawoh and Dibua’s 23 cites. Nor will we find Motta (1972) cited, either, as standing for itself, for hope for an otherwise discredited developmentalism, or as representative of the outputs of Brazil’s 2500-plus Portuguese language peer reviewed journals.

In effect, the knowledge terrain has had to be cleared, any difficult natives removed, and barriers constructed before it can be safely re-occupied by North Atlantic managerial colonialists. And so it came to pass. Following the North Atlantic’s fear that emerging economies threatened its place in the world order, not through terror, but through public policy, they were targeted through the deployment, as in the Cold War, of managerialist rationality. The complicity of the North-Atlantic management academy in this is symbolized in the [US]-Academy of Management’s forthcoming ‘Africa Conference’, to be held in Johannesburg. Notwithstanding other countries have their own management scholarly associations, and indeed that there is an umbrella organization of them all [IFSAM. The International Federation of Scholarly Associations of Management], the [US] Academy of Management feels its mission (that word of imperial redolence) is, as our introductory quote says, to “bring Africa’s unique capabilities and needs to the attention of the world’s organization and management scholars” (Academy of Management, 2013). African organization and management scholars are, of course, part of the world; and the US-AOM is representative of only of itself, and has no mandate to bring anything to the attention of the ‘world’s organization and management scholars. This is, of course, unless it believes that the world’s scholar and the USA’s scholar’s are the same people. Yet again, the determined ahistoricism and ignoring of African, and development studies, scholarship is present. Had, for example, McKinsey’s extractive 1970s tyranny in Tanzania been acknowledged, we might have expected to see reparations amongst the conference’s themes. After all, North Atlantic managerialism is about nothing if it is not about the bottom line.

But no; instead, there are four themes: Navigating Institutions: Business, Government, and Civil Society; Emerging Market Firms and MNCs: Characteristics and Global Aspirations; Base of the Pyramid: Emerging Market Consumers, Workers, and Managers; and Cultural Diversity and Transformational Societies. Not one of these framings of Africa is without imperial legacy and implication. Following just the third of these for now, BOP, its roots are in international strategic management studies (e.g., BRUGMANN and PRAHALAD, 2007; BRUTON, 2010), and particularly in Michigan’s C K Prahalad’s (2009) *The Fortune at*

the Bottom of the Pyramid: Eradicating Poverty Through Profits. The title says little, but enough. The word ‘fortune’ certainly invites an inversion of claims to offer a pro-poor marketization agenda. Not least, there is something of an echo of the way empire was always sold to white speculators, as the source of unimaginable wealth (there’s gold in them there favelas and shantytowns). Taking this further, we would argue BOP’s strategy of tractor-beaming emerging economies’ citizens, and their autonomous economic activity into the maw of multinational corporations, is a for-profit colonization of what managerialism would have us believe are institutional voids. Hence, the requirement for new, marketized institutional structures, all the better to extract wealth with. This is just as, in earlier decades of imperialism, colonial anthropologists were institutional inventors, scientifically formulating ‘tribes’ which then had to have ‘chiefs’, in order to provide an institutional structure which the colonial extractors might engage and operationalize their profiteering.

This BOPist ‘helping’, led by the United States requires the invisibilization and delegitimization of developing country institutions, beyond those of higher education and research. The deceit is that there is an institutional tabula rasa on which BOP managerialism’s solutions can be imposed. Its texts and prescriptions assume nations possess no legitimate opponents to marketization, no trades unions, no employment legislation, no state owned enterprises or financial institutions. Or, whether we like it or not, no Workers Party candidate elected to Presidential office, three times in a row, with popularity ratings hitherto always in the majority (Brazil); or, in the US-AOM’s South Africa, a ruling party in a longstanding tripartite alliance with the trades unions (the COSATU of our introductory quote) and the Communist Party. Yet managerialism’s concurrent claims to apolitical efficiency and rationality also carry the heavy implication that the presence of these contaminating institutions is de facto un-reasonable. This undermining is hammered home, as BOPism invokes its rationality for, the highest of ethical purposes, to stop people from starving. The fortune-making, the profit, is incidental neither here nor there. Or, perhaps, it is here, but it was there.

Of course, sometimes this challenge to legitimacy is more than implicit. Brazil’s National Development Bank (BNDES), is substantial, larger than the World Bank. It is wholly appropriate that Brazilian NGOs establish a platform, <http://www.plataformabndes.org.br>, through which they collectively hold BNDES up to scrutiny, notwithstanding the legitimacy it accrues as an institution of a democratic state. Though still a development bank, this makes it wholly different to the World Bank. Its President is chosen by the USA only, but reigns over the world (the clue is in the name). This time, though, the world is everywhere *except* the USA. Still, civil society scrutiny is a good thing. We do balk, though, at the funding of this platform by the US Ford Foundation. To apparently digress, Thomas Carroll is quite a famous figure in the institutional history of North Atlantic managerialism. He was Dean of Business at Syracuse University, and then of Commerce at University of North Carolina (both in the United States), before becoming Ford’s Vice President in 1953, where, as Khurana (2007) points out, he was to produce an influential report which was to shape management education in the USA (CARROLL, 1954). During the mid-1950s and early 1960s, the Ford Foundation built on USAID’s work to establish EBAP’s sister business school (EAESP) in Sao Paulo. Shortly before his death in 1964 Carroll visited Sao Paulo. And while there, he met, and gave advice on his plans to the new Brazilian military dictatorship’s finance minister, while at the same time eliciting his support for EAESP (ALCADIPANI and COOKE, 2013). So, some might question the Ford Foundation’s right to ever intervene subsequently in Brazil (although, after all, McKinsey still does intervene in Tanzania). We would certainly suggest there is some irony in its concern for accountability, and that management’s new imperialists, espousing the same economic and ethical agenda that justified early 20th century colonial administration, might find here some food for thought.

This mention of colonial administration encourages us to turn an imperial-development mirror on managerialism’s two foundational epistemologies and methodologies (BARLEY and KUNDA, 1992). Here, too, the evidence affirms Trouillot’s observation that the Atlantic colonial encounter was constitutive of modernity. First, the explicit direction and coercion of workers through ‘scientific management,’ did not originate, as management’s own historians would have it, in the closed factory, but in the plantation of the US South, so as to productively discipline the four million (in 1861) enslaved workers there. These were, in

turn technologically (the railroads) and economically embedded in the modern global economy (COOKE, 2004). Second, the humanist, soft, or cultural approach to management, in which workers are given some, limited autonomy in order that they might ‘buy-in’ to the labour process has its roots in British Colonial administration’s early twentieth Century notion of the Dual Mandate, and its operationalization as Indirect Rule. Redolent of the mission of the US-AoM in Africa, and the tenets of BOP, the dual (i.e. two) mandates of imperial responsibility were for the economic and for the cultural wellbeing of colonial subjects, who were of course too backward to know what was in their own best interests. For economic wellbeing, we will, of course read extraction; for cultural wellbeing, compliance. Indirect Rule was a mode of permitting limited autonomy to colonial subjects – or rather, to their (oft-invented) ‘tribal chiefs’, thereby attempting to coopt local elites, so long as they accepted that ‘sovereign power was reserved. Action research, now depicted as the basis of the cultural turn in management, was invented, inter-alia, as a mode of enacting Indirect Rule on Native American reservations in the New Deal USA (COOKE, 2003).

Management & Development: Still Dual Modernizations?

These last two cases have begun to set out the simultaneous intertwining and distancing of management and development. In this section, we complicate this further. According to Corbridge (2007), the mainstream of development practice is committed to two main, contradictory principles. The first is of difference - the Third World is different from the First World; the second is similarity (‘we’ should make ‘them’ more like ‘us’) Difference has been translated in development as hierarchy. Development discourses and policies are mobilized by developed countries to cause the underdeveloped to progress. This is in the same way that Eurocentric modernity has always been imposed on barbarians, non-white, and non-civilized people as the only and necessary route to civilization (QUIJANO, 2000; cf also, managerially, our comment on the Dual Mandate). Simultaneously, the achievement of similarity is always framed as a necessary condition for a civilized world. Barbarians and savages must be drawn away from their otherwise ‘natural’ commitment to backwardness and violence. Just as Maslow’s hierarchy of needs depicted a naturalized metaphysical path to human civilization and enlightenment, so Rostow’s stages of economic development depicted a similarly naturalized path to civilized development. Maslow saw direct parallels between himself and Rostow; and both believed that the only place in the World where their idealized utopias were achievable was the USA, and that the rest of the world should aspire to be civilized in the same way (COOKE MILLS and KELLEY, 2005) . Of course, where some would be civilized on their own terms, the village had to be destroyed in order to save it. When that was the case, the deployment of managerialist rationality in the perpetration of organized violence was unhesitating. Hence literally Fordist management principles were thoroughly applied militarily by former Ford Motor Company President Robert McNamara, as US Secretary of Defence, in the war on Vietnam (SHEEHAN, 1988).

We would argue that this commitment to similarity and difference is a worldview shared by both development (certainly international development) and management studies. If management studies has a single foundational text, it is F W Taylor’s Principles of Scientific Management (1911), sharing the same publisher with C K Prahalad 98 years later. In this, Taylor famously describes a backward immigrant worker, ‘Schmidt’, speaking only pigeon English, who is socialized and ordered – indeed civilized - through scientific management’s economic reason into the US’s steel manufacture processes. The mills in which Schmidt and Taylor worked produced rails for the railroads being constructed by US capital across the Americas, and armor plating and big guns for US battleships (COOLING, 1979; KANIGEL, 1997). United States’ domination of its Latin American ‘backyard’ (e.g. JONES, 2000) was thus secured, by commerce and by force, and by land and by sea.

Meanwhile, at the micro-level, scientific management’s separation of human beings into those fit for ‘brain’ work, and those fit only for ‘hand’ work, and its insistence on selection of ‘right man [sic] for the right job’, apparently evolved in the present day into sophisticated techniques of identifying and measuring human capabilities and competences associated with human resource management, have their genealogy in colonial

anthropologists' obsessions with rational methodologies for distinguishing 'race' in people. Taylorism's scientific deconstruction of the human being was also a direct mirroring of the nearly contemporaneous commodification of human beings as differentiated products in the slave markets of the US South (COOKE, 2004). The actual Schmidt was of European sophistication and a successful entrepreneur in his own right (KANIGEL, 1997). The necessity of his misrepresentation through a difference/similarity narrative, in which a backward man is civilized into the productive effort needed to civilize/Americanize the world speaks to the imaginary power of the trope among North Atlantic elites, to whom Taylor was evangelizing his principles. That was then, though; but as we have argued, it still is now.

Overview of the Special Issue

In the preceding sections, we have set out – as coherently as we can – the understandings which motivated our production of this special issue. Our contributors will have others, of course, and not least may want to leave more open the possibilities of a productive, even emancipatory development management relationship. In this, we accept that in our introduction, and its focus on international development, we have definitely understated the contributions of Brazilian theorists of development and underdevelopment, and the revival of the analyses of Celso Furtado, to be found in Wanderley and Faria (2012a,b)

Immediately following this editorial is Motta and Schmitt's aforementioned keynote commentary, in which they update the ideas from his 1972 paper, given the transformations of Brazilian, and global society, and of public administration over the last 40 years. Paulo Motta kindly accepted our invitation to contribute, and with Valentina Schmitt provided us an update of his ideas, given the many transformations of society and specially public administration over the last forty years. His article shows that the development -management (or the development –administration nexus) still must be a major object of research and analysis, to be embraced by the academic community and institutions in Brazil

The first article of this special issue shows that fostering the dialogue between development and management can be an important way to challenge the present state of things. It brings to light the colonizing role of international cooperation in the management of development programs in the southwest region of Bahia. Wesley Santana argues that the specific conditions of this semi-arid region, and the inequality across the corresponding sub-regions, create favorable conditions for the marriage of development and dependency. He adds that the absence of a field focused on the development management nexus in Brazil is a major factor in the problematic situations which affect the large population concerned. Santana's critical investigation of a communitarian development project in the region of Gavião River shows, however, that international cooperation fostered by less powerful organizations creates minor opportunities for the deployment of 'alternative management' and 'alternatives to management'. The article suggests that such opportunities are rare –a result not only of political asymmetries faced by local communities in relation to Northern (in the global sense) development agendas and institutions, and regional government; but also because of epistemic asymmetries, related to the mechanisms of imposition of Euro-American management. In the end, Wesley argues that the large population of those sub-regional spaces in Bahia requires "an-other" management (for development) which is capable of fostering participation, inclusion and empowerment of local people/powers.

In the second article, Carlos Milani and Julio Loureiro investigate the role of international development cooperation in Duque de Caxias, a municipality of Rio de Janeiro (one of the most important states in the South of Brazil), which faces problems not very different from those faced by in the North of Brazil, even though Duque de Caxias is wealthy, the 8th municipality by ranking of national product. The authors embrace a critical perspective, as a necessary. By taking a border position from within the developed South in Rio de Janeiro – the first author was a professor at one of the few universities in Duque de Caxias (i.e., Unigranrio) and the second author, who was supervised by the first for his Master's degree, and is nowadays a full-time academic there – they begin their paper by questioning the conditions that have made possible Duque de

Caxias' privileged economic position, and its underprivileged social, political and human development positions. Duque de Caxias, they argue, illustrates and embodies the contradictions of development, its inequalities derived from the presence of International Development agencies supported by local elites. They investigate the role of these agencies in Duque de Caxias and question the scarcity of studies on this matter, given their significance in the locale. Overall their investigation shows that the local lack of expertise in "development management" – as pointed out by Paulo Motta and Valentina Schmitt, as an epistemic gap has affected not just regions in both the North and South of Brazil but the country as a whole. Conditions of asymmetry are reinforced by the local-global nexus of international development. Local authorities do not have skills and resources to "manage" international organizations and their programs undertaken in cooperation with other local organizations. As a result, citizens and communities in Duque de Caxias are distanced from the political realm which affect their lives (paralleling Santana's first article here); but so are the "managers" who should be responsible for engaging with these organizations. In conclusion, they reflect on how new forms of relationship with international agencies should be built in Duque de Caxias to overcome the perverse model of development, which has become dominant in one of Brazil's developed South's most important municipalities.

The third article of this special issue adds to the arguments raised by the authors of the second paper. Barros and Carrieri, both from the Federal University of Minas Gerais, follow earlier studies by Alcadipani and Cooke (2013), and Bertero, Alcadipani, Cabral et al (2013), in the founding of development and/or management education in Brazil. Their specific, empirically grounded, contribution is important in affirming the broad trends discussed in the earlier parts of our introduction, using archival and other empirical material from the 1950s and 1960s to outline the founding of management education in Brazil in that period. What they make absolutely clear is that this institutional domain was established as a consequence of US-Brazilian international relations imperatives of the time. So, they show, following Bertero, Alcadipani, Cabral et al (2013), that FGV-EBAP was set up specifically as a way of fulfilling Truman's point IV commitments in Brazil, and as an attempt to cement inter-governmental relationships. However the situation on the ground was different – there was resistance to Americanization and the development- managerialization of the curriculum – from economists who had disciplinary interests, but also from those who were opposed to the Americanization of Brazil's development endeavor per se.

In the fourth article the Jackeline de Andrade, José Neto and José Valadão, all from the Federal University of Pernambuco, engage with the development-management nexus from the standpoint of (social) technology. More specifically, they criticize the "alternatives of development" raised by social perspectives on technology (so-called social technologies). The authors undertake a detailed case study, based on actor-network theory, of the technological trajectory of a successful program in the semi-arid region of Bahia – the so-called "Um Milhão de Cisternas Rurais". Their investigation is based on the critical argument that research on the management and development together should foster the understanding of the translations undertaken by actors involved in those technological processes of transformation, and of how strategic actions are related to alternative 'managements' in development. From such perspective the authors show that patterns of cultural creativity and social morphogenesis, which feature "true development," as theorized by Celso Furtado (1974; 1982), are a key feature of this program. In the end the authors recognize that those findings do not mean that the imposition of "development management" through social technologies by the more powerful has not ceased. It is still necessary to foster further investigations in Brazil and elsewhere which challenge the mainstream literature on management development. This they argue might be achieved through a theoretical perspective that takes "true development" and alternative managements in the South as possibilities that should be brought to bear.

In the fifth article, Carlos Justen and Luis Neto, both from Federal University of Santa Catarina, develop a theoretical analysis of the management-development nexus to build alternatives based on the notion of *social management*. The authors highlight the crisis of Eurocentric modernity and the intellectual coloniality in management and organizational studies as main justification for fostering a more dialogical notion of development in/from the South. The authors set out the case for an "Anthropological and Ecological Movement" from which to articulate a development - management dialogue. Their work explores further,

and in specific ways, some of the human-centred issues also raised in the Andrade et al paper that precedes it. They argue that that the fundamental ecological principle of interdependency, and an anthropological perspective on management are necessary to reconnect management and development in an alternative perspective, albeit somewhat utopian, to the dominant Eurocentric reified unilateralism. In the end, the authors put forward eight propositions from an anthropological-ecological perspective for what might be seen as the redetermination of the logic of development – the logic of the dialogical symbiosis man/nature.

The last paper by Maria Ceci Misoczky of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil and Steffen Böhm of the University of Essex, is important in a number of ways. It extends our consideration of development interventions to consider the extractive industries, and the role of the World Bank in unleashing them on local communities, in the name of its 1990s ultra-neo-liberal model of development. It extends the national considerations in this journal to Argentina; and in so doing, fundamentally and importantly, serves to explicate the seeming inexorability of the development project generally, and development interventions specifically, can be opposed and resisted by local communities. What they also demonstrate is managerialist responses to this resistance, in the form of CSR and corporate governance. In presenting this account, importantly for this Special Issue, and for engagements with development management generally, they also give voice to those normally silent/silenced by such interventions.

Concluding – or opening up transmodern possibilities?

Here we conclude the introduction, but the important part of the issue is about to begin. In this, Maria Ceci Misoczky and Steffen Böhm have been co-opted into doing one last favour for us as editors, by our placing their article last in the sequence. What they help us, and our readers, with, is a theorization of development-as-modernization, drawn, inter-alia from Quijano (2000), and, particularly, Dussell (2011). In this, they provide a philosophy and an epistemology, grounded not just in the Atlantic, but the Latin American debates on modernity, alternative modernities, and alternatives to modernity. These are gaining currency in the field of management and organization studies as a necessary response to the reworkings of imperial management and organization studies. This may be getting repetitive, but in so doing, once again, they point to the conceptual lacunae in North Atlantic managerialism, and its engagements with development and the dark side of Eurocentric modernity (MIGNOLO, 2011). This is notwithstanding the claims to reflexivity in the metaphysics of its enquiry managerialism has always made.

Maria Ceci Misoczky's and Steffen Böhm's paper therefore enables us to frame the others this special issue from a perspective attuned with the utopian and generous concept of transmodernity put forward by Enrique Dussel within the realms of philosophy (of liberation) and relentlessly pursued by with management and organization studies by Eduardo Ibarra-Colado (1957-2013). Eduardo was a dear friend, a kind man, and is much missed, and we dedicate this special issue to him (DUSSEL and IBARRA-COLADO, 2006; IBARRA-COLADO, 2006; 2008; 2010). Transmodernity represents a sort of utopian endeavor from Latin America which requires us not just to turn our backs to Eurocentric modernity, given that "modernity" itself represents an amalgamation of knowledges, traditions and possibilities which have been eliminated from/by the dominant episteme due to geopolitical and imperial motives (DUSSEL, 2011). Those motives have been challenged in different ways by all the papers of this special issue, representing, then, a range of possibilities of transmodernity, or at least, enabling the conditions of its possibility. Insofar as this is the case, the development/management fissures and cracks are beginning to be levered open. Of course we need much more than this, and there is only so much a special issue can do. For this reason we hope at least that it is a motivator of many other contributions from different parts of the world (and in many other languages).

Through permitting the possibility of transmodernity we hope that the readers will be able to enact a range of possibilities (rather than just the one) to co-construct the pluriversal amalgamation of knowledges and epistemes which was interrupted by the aforesaid darker sides of Eurocentric modernity. In spite of all the asymmetries and injustices that the fields of management-development and management and organization

studies represent, enact, and enable, and aware of the dangers (not least of cooptation) we do believe, in order to bring transmodernity back to life, that collectively we have to engage. In this special issue, we, our authors, reviewers, and Cadernos EBAPE.BR have done as much as we can to make it accessible, interesting, and 'relevant' to our North Atlanticist colleagues. Their future can only be realized –, and their, and our own, emancipation/liberation can only be achieved through – an engagement of the South, shaped by a self-determined decision to de(con)struct the unspoken North-Atlanticist geo-politics of their orthodoxies. This is a precondition to the deployment of transmodernity and co-construction of a world in which many worlds (and knowledges) can coexist.

References

- ALCADIPANI, R.; CALDAS, M. Americanizing Brazilian management. **Critical Perspectives on International Business**, v. 8, n. 1, p. 37-55, 2012.
- _____; COOKE, B. The Ford Foundation's Mess in Brazil. **Best Paper Proceedings of the Academy of Management Meeting**, 2013.
- _____. et al. Southern voices in Management and organization knowledge. **Organization**, v. 19, n. 2, p. 131-143. 2012.
- BARLEY, S.; KUNDA, G. Design and devotion: Surges of rational and normative ideologies of control in managerial discourse. **Administrative Science Quarterly**, p. 363-399, 1992.
- BERTERO, C. et al. Os desafios da produção de conhecimento em administração no Brasil. **Cadernos EBAPE.BR**, v. 11, n. 1, p. 181-196, 2013.
- BRUGMANN, J.; PRAHALAD, C. Co-Creating Business's New Social Compact. **Harvard Business Review**, v. 85, n. 2, p. 80–90, 2007.
- BRUTON, G. Business and the World's Poorest Billion: The Need for an Expanded Examination by Management Scholars. **Academy of Management Perspectives**, v. 24, n. 3, p. 6–10, 2010.
- BURRELL, G. **Pandemonium: Towards a Retro-Organization Theory**. London: Sage. 1997
- CALÁS, M.; SMIRCICH, L. Organization@21 The journal of disconcerting organization theory and action. **Organization**, v. 20, n. 1, p. 13-23, 2013.
- COOKE, B. Participation, 'process' and management: lessons for development in the history of organization development. **Journal of International Development**, v. 10, p. 35–54, 1998.
- _____. A new continuity with colonial administration: participation in development management. **Third World Quarterly**, v. 24, n.1, p. 47-61, 2003.
- _____. The management of the (Third) World. **Organization**, v. 11, n. 5, p. 603-29, 2004.
- _____; MILLS, A.; KELLEY, E. Situating Maslow in Cold War America: a Recontextualization of Management Theory. **Group and Organization Management**, v. 30, n. 2, p. 129-152, 2005.
- _____. Managerialism as knowing and making Latin America: international development management and world bank interventions. In: Guedes, A.; Faria, A. (eds) **International Management and International Relations**. London: Routledge p. 161-184, 2010.
- COOLING, B. F. **Gray Steel and Blue Water Navy: The Formative Years of America's Military Industrial Complex**. Hamden Connecticut: Archon Books. 1979.

- CORBRIDGE, S. The (im)possibility of development studies. **Economy and Society**, v. 36, n. 2, p. 179-211, 2007.
- DAR,S.; COOKE, B. **The New Development Management: Critiquing the Dual Modernization** [eds] Londo: Zed Books. 2008.
- DOS SANTOS, T. **A Teoria da Dependência: Balanços e Perspectivas**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2000.
- DUSSEL, E. Transmodernidad e interculturalidad (Interpretacion desde la Filosofia de la Liberacion). In: Lander, E. (org) **La colonialidad Del saber: eurocentrismo y ciências sociales**. Buenos Aires: CLACSO. 2nd Ed, 2011.
- _____; IBARRA-COLADO, E. Globalization, Organization and the Ethics of Liberation. **Organization**, 2006.
- ESCOBAR, A. **Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- FARIA, A. Repensando produtivismo em gestão no (e a partir do) Brasil. **Cadernos EBAPE. BR**, v. 9, n. 4, pp. 1164-1173, 2011.
- _____; IBARRA-COLADO, E.; GUEDES, A. Internationalization of management, neoliberalism and the Latin America challenge. **Critical Perspectives on International Business**, v. 6, n. 2/3, p. 97–115, 2010.
- FRYNAS, J. The false developmental promise of Corporate Social Responsibility: evidence from multinational oil companies. **International Affairs**, v. 81, n. 3, p. 581-198, 2005.
- _____. Corporate social responsibility and international development: critical assessment. **Corporate Governance: An International Review**, v. 16, n. 4, p. 274-281, 2008.
- GLOSNY, M. China and the BRICs: A Real (but Limited) Partnership in a Unipolar World. **Polity**, v. 42, n. 1, p. 100-129, 2010
- GREENWALD, G. McASKILL, I. Boundless Informant: the NSA's secret tool to track global surveillance data. **The Guardian**, June 11. Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/jun/08/nsa-boundless-informant-global-datamining>. Retrieved on: June 25, 2013.
- GUEDES, A.; FARIA, A. (Eds.). **International Management and International Relations: a Critical Perspective from Latin America**. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- GULRAJANI, N. New vistas for development management: examining radical–reformist possibilities and potential. **Public Administration and Development**, v. 30, n. 2, p. 136-148, 2010.
- HARVIE, D. et al. What are we to do with feral publishers?. **Organization**, v. 19, n. 6, p. 905-914, 2012.
- IBARRA-COLADO, E. Organization Studies and Epistemic Coloniality in Latin America: Thinking Otherness from the Margins. **Organization**, v. 13, n.4, p. 489-508, 2006.
- _____. Is There Any Future for Critical Management Studies in Latin America? Moving from Epistemic Coloniality to “Trans-Discipline”. **Organization**, v. 15, n. 6, p. 932–35, 2008.
- _____. Neoliberal Globe/centrism and International Management Blindness: The Indispensable Decolonial Turn. In: Guedes, A.; Faria, A. (eds) **International Management and International Relations**, p. 29-60. London: Routledge, 2010.
- _____. Cómo comprender y transformar los Estudios Organizacionales desde América Latina y no morir en el intento. In: Martinez, A. et al (orgs). **Apropiación social del conocimiento y aprendizaje: una mirada crítica desde diferentes ámbitos**. Madrid: Plaza y Valdés Editores, 2012
- IBHAWOH, B.; DIBUA, J. Deconstructing Ujamaa: The legacy of Julius Nyerere in the Quest for social and economic development in Africa. **African Journal of Political Science**, v. 8, n.1, p. 59-83, 2003.

-
- JONES, M. America's backyard. **Diplomacy & Statecraft**, v.11, n 1, p. 291-298, 2000.
- KANIGEL, R. **The One Best Way**: Frederick Winslow Taylor and the Enigma of Efficiency. New York: Viking Penguin, 1997.
- KAPLAN, R. Supremacy by stealth. **The Atlantic Monthly**, v. 292, n.1, 2003.
- KERR, R. International development and the New Public Management: Projects and Logframes as Discursive Technologies of Governance. In Dar, S.; Cooke, B. (eds). **The New Development Management**. London: Zed Books, 2008.
- KHURANA, R. **From Higher Aims to Hired Hands**, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- LOCKE, R. **The collapse of the American management mystique**. Oxford: Oxford University, 1996.
- MAGOMBA, L. Tanzania External Debt Hits U.S. \$10.7 Billion. All Africa Business Week, Available at: <http://allafrica.com/stories/201302190246.html>. Retrieved on: 18 feb, 2013.
- MAX, J. **The development of local government in Tanzania**. Dar es Salaam: Educational Publishers and Distributors, 1991.
- MIGNOLO, W. **The Darker Side of Western Modernity**. Durham & London: Duke University, 2011.
- MOTTA, P. R. Administração para o Desenvolvimento: A disciplina em busca da relevância. **Revista de Administração Pública**, v. 6, n. 3, p. 39-53, 1972.
- MURPHY, J. **The World Bank and Global Managerialism**. London: Routledge, 2008.
- _____; ZHU, J. Neo-colonialism in the academy? Anglo-American domination in management journals. **Organization**, v. 19, n. 6, pp. 915-927, 2012.
- PORTER, M.; KRAMER, M. Creating Shared Value. **Harvard Business Review**, n. January–February, p. 1–17, 2011.
- PRAHALAD, C. K. **The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid**: Eradicating Poverty Through Profits. Prentice Hall, 2009.
- _____; HART, S. The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid. **Strategy and Business**, v. 26, p. 2–14, 2002.
- QUIJANO, A. Modernidad, colonialidad y América Latina. **Neplanta. Views from the South**, v. 1, n. 3, p. 533-580, 2000.
- RESNICK, I. N. Review of Colin Legum, Geoffrey Mmari, (eds.) **Mwalimu**: The Influence of Nyerere. 1996. Available at: <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=415>.
- ROSA, A.; ALVES, M. Pode o conhecimento em gestão e organização falar português? **Revista de Administração de Empresas**, v. 51, n.3, p. 255-264, 2011.
- ROSTOW, W. **The stages of economic growth: a non-communist manifesto**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1960.
- ROY, A. Praxis in the time of Empire. **Planning Theory**, v. 5, n. 1, p. 7-29, 2006.
- SHEEHAN, N. **A Bright, Shining Lie**: John Paul Vann and America in Vietnam. Vintage UK, 1998.
- STIGLITZ, J. **Globalization and its discontents**. New York: W.W Norton. 2002.
- TAYLOR, F. **The Principles of Scientific Management**. New York: Harper. 1911
-

TROULLIOT, M.R. **Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History**. Boston, Mass: Beacon Press. 2008

WANDERLEY, S.; FARIA, A. The Chandler-Furtado case: a decolonial (re)framing of a North/South (dis)encounter. **Management & Organizational History**, v. 7, n. 3, p. 219-236, 2012a.

_____; _____. Descolonizando a gestão estratégica: o (des)encontro Alfred Chandler-Celso Furtado. **Cadernos do Desenvolvimento**, v. 7, n. 11, p.129-143, 2012b.