



Organizações & Sociedade Journal  
2021, 28(98), 549-581

© Authors 2021

DOI 10.1590/1984-92302021v28n9804EN

ISSN 1984-9230

www.revistaoes.ufba.br

NPGA, School of Management

Federal University of Bahia

Associate Editor:

Cintia Oliveira

Received: 08/28/2019

Accepted: 07/17/2020

# Can We Co-Construct a Field of Management / Administration Engaged with the Majority?

Alexandre Faria<sup>a</sup>

Márcio Moutinho Abdalla<sup>b</sup>

Ana Lucia Guedes<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> EBAPE – Getúlio Vargas Foundation, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

<sup>b</sup> Fluminense Federal University, Volta Redonda, Brazil

## Abstract

Dynamics contrary to the life of the majority mobilized by neo-imperial neo-liberal capitalism evolving toward neo-fascist populism has become virtually invisible to the field of Management/Administration, which is driven by dynamics of appropriation-contention focused on alternatives and transmodern epistemes of the emerging South-East. We analyze this picture of radicalization of global coloniality within the context of counterrevolutionary neoliberalism facing dynamics of dewesternization and decoloniality from a South-North dialogue between Decolonial Theory/Option and Critical Realism. By proposing a critical/decolonial transmodern framework, we unveil dynamics of invisibilization/visibilization against the life of the majority, invisibilized by market sub-theorization and dominant discourse and by the liberal university and its business/management schools. In the end, we propose to recover the expanded relevance of “administration/management” engaged with the majority, through reappropriation dynamics based on de-subalternization of non-market and ‘de-celebration’ of free market.

**Keywords:** decolonial theory; critical realism; transmodernity; neoliberalism; colonialism.

## Introduction

Researchers, educators and intellectuals from the Global South who are engaged with decolonial dynamics have challenged the complicity of the field of management/administration in the construction of a capitalist hypermodernity that threatens the life of the majority, understood as a heterogeneous population composed of those who do not occupy privileged spaces of power (Guerreiro Ramos, 1981; Davila, 1991; Paes de Paula, 2008). In response to the rise of the South/East on a global scale starting in the 1960s and 70s, the continuing crises of Global Neoliberal Capitalism (GNC), as it transitions to neo-fascist populist authoritarianism, are accompanied by the radicalization of the racist/colonialist/patriarchal face of capitalist modernity (Sousa Santos, 2018), which both normalizes political impotence (Berardi, 2019) and promotes “other” epistemes/pedagogies historically mobilized by a majority on a global scale (Sousa Santos, 2018).

In response to the supposedly essentialist/separatist threats generated by the emerging South-East, the areas of research and education in management/administration have reproduced neo-imperial dynamics of appropriation and containment on a global scale (Gills, 2014) by means of free market under-theorized discourse mobilized by the neoliberal counterrevolution of capitalist/patriarchal/racist hyper-modernity (Sousa Santos, 2018) headed by transnational capital and privileged elites from the United States (Harvey, 2007). Driven by the cultural-discursive turn and the dominant postmodern theory controlled by the neoliberal university and its management/business schools (Firat & Dholakia, 2006) connected to a system of think tanks and corporate media mobilized by an elite knowledge network (Parmar, 2018) this counterrevolutionary discourse underpinned by racist and colonialist assumptions and materialities redistributes capital and power from the majority to a privileged minority and appropriates and colonizes ideas of freedom combined with anti-racist, anti-colonialist and anti-sexist agendas in order to combat the oppressive Eurocentric state and corresponding theorizations/practices linked to non-capitalism, developmentalisms, communitarianisms and socialisms. Dynamics of visibilization/invisibilization set in motion by a counter-revolutionary North-West facilitate the appropriation and containment of heterogeneous transmodern/decolonial developments in the emerging South-East triggered by dynamics of solidary re-appropriations (Reiter, 2018; Maldonado-Torres, 2007).

These discourses for freedom which appropriate theories-praxis of emancipation from North-West and of liberation from South-East have been renewed in opposition to the dynamics of dewesternization and decolonization accompanied by a vast ecology of knowledges mobilized by the majority on a global scale within and outside the neoliberalized university (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; Sousa Santos & Meneses, 2014), and by an emergence/resurgence of “invisibilized” individuals and collectivities. This picture underpins the radical responses to the globalization of the Zapatista Revolution in Chiapas, and a corresponding resurgence of solidarity alternatives and transmodern epistemes of emancipation-liberation against the radical oppression of capitalism/racism/hetero-patriarchy (Sousa Santos, 2018). By challenging the neoliberal radicalization against the life of majority in the South-East and in the North-West (Higgins, 2004), these movements are classified in the North-West as “essentialism/separatism” (Cornelissen & Höllerer, 2020) and subjected to militarized mechanisms of surveillance and renewed dynamics of invisibilization-visibilization and appropriation-containment, championed by the neoliberal university and its business-management schools.

The field of Management/Administration mobilizes in global scale this complex dynamics of appropriation-containment, anti-essentialism classification of “other” epistemes, and visibilization-invisibilization contrary to the majority. For example, this neoimperial discourse which moves beyond North-South and theory-practice hierarchical binarisms has been mobilized to selectively decolonize the contested, heterogeneous and subalternized area of Public Administration (Farazmand, 1999) by appropriating-containing critical/decolonial developments engaged with the majority and a public sense of extended relevance in both South-East and North-West (e.g. Nkomo, 2015; Ibarra-Colado, 2006; Couto & Carrieri, 2018; Ehrnström-Fuentes, 2016). In sum, the North-South and theory-practice hierarchical binarisms are rearticulated through dynamics of visibilization-invisibilization and appropriation-containment against the majority in global scale and triggered by projects of neoimperial humanization subordinated to the supremacist market discourse.

This market discourse has been challenged on a global scale by researchers from various fields such as marketing (e.g. Firat, 2010; Vieira, 2003), strategic management (Faria, Imasato & Guedes, 2014; Frynas, Child & Tarba, 2017) and public administration (e.g. Abdalla & Faria, 2019; Candler, 2014; Paes de Paula, 2005; Silva & Abdalla, 2020). These authors from the South-East and North-West have criticized the complicity of these discourses with the deepening of discriminatory inequalities, but they virtually ignore counterrevolutionary dynamics of visibilization-invisibilization contrary to the majority and solidary transmodern developments that go beyond North-West vs. South-East binarism.

Market and non-market counterrevolutionary ideas have been hyper-visibilized by universalist neoliberal discourses that invisibilize the worldwide radicalization of this darker side of capitalist hypermodernity and the liberating side of dewesternization and of decoloniality, and corresponding transmodern developments informed by the praxis of solidary re-appropriation (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). This picture is informed not only by the radicalization the Eurocentric geopolitics of capitalism-knowledge, but also by the scarcity of South-North dialogues engaged with the majority, and which challenge this imperial cognitive-material-epistemic complex (Sousa Santos, 2018; Parmar, 2019) and restore transmodern practices of re-appropriation of analytical conceptualizations that go beyond emancipation-liberation and North-South binarisms. Among movements and ‘practical’ re-conceptualizations that restore such engagement with the majority and a public perspective of expanded relevance we highlight popular administration, self-organization, self-development, self-management together with communitarianism, public sociology and the decolonized university (Burawoy, 2005; Mbembe, 2016; Parker, Cheney, Fournier, & Land, 2014; Paes de Paula, 2005; Souza, 2001).

Based on a transmodern South-North dialogue engaged with the majority championed in this article by Decolonial Theory (DT) and Critical Realism (CR), we investigate this complex picture of coloniality in/from South-East and North-West triggered by dynamics of visibilization/invisibilization and appropriation-containment based on two questions: How have neo-imperial dynamics contrary to the majority on a global scale been virtually invisibilized in Management/Administration? How can the reappropriation of transmodern South-North dialogues recover conditions for a ‘public’ Management/Administration field that is engaged with the majority? We uncovered counterrevolutionary dynamics invisibilized by visibilized hegemonic

discourses in order to propose the reappropriation of the expanded relevance of the field by means of de-subalternization of the non-market and de-celebration of the free market.

## **A Transmodern Dialogue with the Majority: Critical Realism and Decoloniality**

The neoliberal revolution, which began in the US in the 1960s-70s within a context of unprecedented decolonization processes in Africa and Asia, connected with dynamics of dewesternization of capitalism and radicalization of civil rights and anti-racist movements in the US, promised liberation and rights for all via market democracy radicalization. Within and outside the predominantly white/Westernized universities (Joseph, 2006), neoliberal discourses were mobilized and hyper-visible by privileged oligarchies, corporate media, and transnational capital (Parmar, 2019), which appropriated discourses, capital, power, struggles and theories/practices mobilized by (and for) the majority and helped to invisibilize the violent reality experienced by a growing population and corresponding solidarity struggles, including growing discriminatory inequality in the Global North/West. In response to the rise of the South-East and continuing dynamics of decolonization within and outside the neoliberal university (Ehrnström-Fuentes, 2016), the ensuing crises of a GNC transitioning to an era of neofascist populist authoritarianism have been informed by the regeneration of such supremacist market discourse, accompanied by dynamics of selective colonization/decolonization of alternative epistemes engaged with the majority.

According to decolonial authors, such ever-expanding field of Management/Administration is a strategic artifact of global coloniality (Ibarra-Colado, 2006). This field has been mobilized in both South-East and North-West by neo-imperial neoliberalism, in response to epistemes engaged with the majority triggered by dynamics of dewesternization/decoloniality (Ibarra-Colado, 2011) which are selectively appropriated and contained by recolonizing mechanisms after being classified as essentialism/separatism by neoliberal university and its business schools (Faria & Hemais, 2020). Decolonial movements trigger not only dynamics of liberation-emancipation engaged with the majority, but also 'defensive' dynamics of recolonization in both South-East and North-West. For example, the subalternized, contested, and heterogeneous area of Public Administration (Painter & Peters, 2010; Farazmand, 1999) has been simultaneously decolonized and recolonized in the North/West and South/East by privileged few who use for 'defensive' expansion a growing number and diversity of decolonial epistemes generated by liberating-emancipating transmodernity in a pluriversal world in which many worlds coexist (Dussel, 2013). Invisibilized by the supremacist discourse of "good governance", the area suffered profound economic-political-military attacks within and outside the increasingly less public university, primarily in the South-East followed by the North-West (Kamola, 2019). These attacks demonize and appropriate the socialist/non-capitalist/post-capitalist/post-socialist face of a global reality in transition mobilized by diverse traditions of 'public administration' together with the equally contested sub-area of development administration/management (Zhang & Ong, 2008; Hirschmann, 1981). In the US, such radicalization of hypermodernity/coloniality drove 1970s anti-essentialism dynamics of subalternization of alternative progressivisms in public administration (Miller, 1994), particularly those informed by solidarity-based transmodern developments driven by the Black Power Civil Rights movement and transmodern praxis of solidary reappropriation triggered by dewesternization/decoloniality movements in the South-East (Joseph, 2006).

This patriarchal-colonialist-racist face of the neoliberal counterrevolution continues to shape 'globally inclusive' theories-practices in the field of Management/Administration and to boost the visibilization of discourses that reproduce the Occidentalist idea of liberal democracy and invisibilize the majority with respective liberating-emancipating struggles and epistemes. These discourses emerge out of dynamics of appropriation-containment of alternatives fostered by the neoliberal university in the West/North, with support of allies in the South/East (Parmar, 2019), mechanisms that reaffirm the classification of transmodern epistemes engaged with the majority as essentialism/separatism and embody 'postcolonial' rearticulations of North-South and theory-practice binarisms against the majority (Cornelissen & Höllerer, 2020). Occidentalist historiographies that reinforce such counterrevolutionary dynamics continue to be contested by historiographies underpinned by the transmodern praxis of solidary reappropriation which are hence appropriated-contained and classified as renewed essentialism, such as the ones championed by African American authors (Joseph, 2006; Allen, 2001; Robinson, 2000).

Market centrism transformed into *pensée unique* by the radical counterrevolutionary New Right during Ronald Reagan's Republican administrations, created conditions that enabled "public administration" to promote the contested neoliberalization of the public university and to transform investments by large corporations into key dimensions of a neo-imperial foreign policy protected by expanding military and epistemic apparatus (Rogin, 1990). By helping to promote the selective decolonization-recolonization of public administration, the field imposed a counterrevolutionary version of academic relevance accompanied by radical mechanisms of control, metrification and surveillance with a focus on 'irremediable and seductive separatists' within the growingly corporatized and militarized neoliberal university (Lorenz, 2012). The field helped to invisibilize both the precarious reality experienced by a growing, unequal and heterogeneous majority, and dynamics of appropriation-containment focused on transmodern alternatives and epistemes driven by economic/political/cultural dynamics of dewesternization and decoloniality classified and visibilized as essentialism/separatism.

For instance, critical and progressive authors who nowadays admit the field's complicity with capitalist neoliberalism in generating economic inequality contrary to the majority in the "heart" of the North/West (Fotaki & Prasad, 2015; Murphy & Willmott, 2015; Khurana, 2010) still ignore the criticisms of the South regarding the field's complicity in reproducing the racist/colonialist side of capitalist modernity on a global scale (Ibarra-Colado, 2006) and corresponding transmodern emancipating-liberating developments engaged with the majority. Counterrevolutionary dynamics foster the radicalization of discriminatory inequality since these solidary developments which restore and expand the reappropriation praxis are being 'dangerously' enunciated from within the neoliberal university and its business schools in the North-West (e.g. Prasad et al., 2015; Dar et al., 2020).

Impacted by structural colonialism/racism renewed by counterrevolutionary dynamics of de/recolonization championed by the corporatized neoliberal university (Mbembe, 2016), decolonial researchers engaged with the majority face accusations of promotion of separatist essentialism. In the name of epistemological democracy in the field, which is still led by an increasingly uneven, heterogeneous and discriminatory North/West (Boatcă, 2015), privileged academics renew the racialization of the decolonial episteme and foster the rewesternizing re-articulation of selective decolonizing-recolonizing dynamics on a global scale by imposing

universalist Eurocentric postcolonial theory as the “only alternative” for an effectively post-colonial ‘global’ world which in the end reaffirm the North-South and theory-practice binarisms predominantly against the majority (Cornelissen & Höllerer, 2020). Using a transmodern dialogue between CR and DT, we argue that the field of Management/Administration should not only be decolonized from the South (Ibarra-Colado, 2006), but should also promote re-engaging the invisibilized majority in both the North-West and the South-East by restoring the transmodern praxis of solidary reappropriation and a public perspective of expanded relevance which recognizes dynamics that incentivize and appropriate decolonial movements to foster selective recolonization against the majority within a radically unequal, stratified and discriminatory global reality.

The Decolonial Theory/Option (DT) enunciated by researchers from the South (Grosfoguel, 2008, 2012; Mignolo, 2011a) has obtained increasing interest in the North/West from researchers who are more subjected to the radicalization of coloniality (e.g. Prasad et al., 2015), but not yet to CR (Fleetwood, 2005; Reed, 2005). One reason for this is that, in the academic world of the North/West, CR has been marginalized for being classified, on the one hand, as positivism and naive realism by postmodernist and post-structuralist theories (Fleetwood, 2005) which have helped to constitute and regenerate the neoliberal (counter-)revolution (Gill, 1995); on the other hand, CR is seen by decolonial authors as another Eurocentric criticism of Eurocentrism (Mignolo, 2012) and, therefore, constituent of the dynamics of radicalization of the obscurer aspect of Eurocentrism, denied and invisibilized by modernity/coloniality. We embrace the ongoing transmodernity project engaged with the southern majority since 1492 (Dussel, 2013; Maldonado-Torres, 2007), which has informed diverse movements of liberation-emancipation, such as the Zapatista revolution in Mexico and anti-racism movements in the US calling for civil rights within and outside Eurocentric universities (Grosfoguel, 2012). In recent decades, decolonial transmodernity has been reactivated by the Argentinian philosopher Enrique Dussel (Dussel, 2013) from a pro-majority global perspective that moves beyond the contested Latin Americanist commitment with conceptual delinking (Couto & Carrieri, 2018; Domingues, 2009; Maldonado-Torres, 2007).

Against the myth of self-generated modernity and moving beyond the decolonial conceptualization of delinking (see Mignolo & Walsh, 2018), advocates of decolonial transmodernity emphasize that relevant developments of “modernity” represent amalgamations of knowledge, traditions, movements and struggles, which have been appropriated-contained or subalternized/co-opted by the geopolitics of the knowledge of Eurocentric modernity since 1492 (Dussel, 2011). We restore this perspective to promote the transmodern praxis of solidary reappropriation engaged with the majority (Faria & Hemais, 2020). Starting with the emerging South-East that exists in both the South and the North (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018), we dialog critically with Eurocentric modernity from a life-preserving perspective beyond rejection or discrimination (Dussel, 2005; Grosfoguel, 2008, 2012). In short, decolonial transmodernity informs our South-North dialogue with the objective of “making visible the invisible and analyzing the mechanisms that produce such invisibility or distorted visibility in light of a large stock of ideas that must necessarily include the critical reflections of the “invisible” people themselves” (Maldonado-Torres, 2007: 262).

We hence embrace CR (Bhaskar et al., 1998) from a pluriversal perspective that goes beyond the North-South, theory-practice or colonized-colonizer binarisms established by capitalist modernity without, however, dissolving them. Developed in the Anglo-European world as an emancipatory research program from a universalist perspective, CR states that, to be authentic, an

entity “has causal efficacy; it has an effect on behavior; it makes a difference” (Fleetwood, 2005: 199). Bearing in mind that, according to many critics of CR, “it is usually difficult to know what [its main author, Roy Bhaskar] thinks” (Magill, 1994, p. 116), we look for inspiration in the metaphor of the iceberg, used to make CR less abstract and inaccessible (Hartwig, 2015), by highlighting that most of the dynamics of the stratified real are invisible or invisibilized (Faria, 2011). In sum, the ontology/epistemology of CR states that reality exists and that it is not totally independent from knowledge, interpretation or observation – in short, from identification through cognizant subjects (Fleetwood, 2005).

As a universalist episteme of the North-West also constituted by dynamics of appropriation-containment triggered by Eurocentric modernity/coloniality, CR challenges the Eurocentric canons of science to define social research within or outside academia as that “which aims at discovering, by a mixture of experimentation and theoretical reasoning, the entities, structures, and mechanisms (visible or invisible) that exist and operate in the world” (Bhaskar et al., 1998: 322). Evidencing the invisible beyond the visible or apparent requires the social or socialist researcher to search for transparency, precision and clarity in processes of mobilizing assumptions, models, or illusory beliefs that are inevitably mediated through stratified reality and respective mechanisms of causality (Mir & Watson, 2001). On the one hand, critical realists delink from DT by overlooking or denying the *longue durée* of racialist/colonialist dimensions that constitute what Eurocentric modernity/coloniality defines as “science,” “critique,” “socialism,” or “social research” from a perspective of universality (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). On the other hand, the intransitive dimension of CR (Bhaskar, 2008) dialogs with DT by claiming that patriarchal, class, and gender/race structures that comprise capitalist modernity do not have to be identified in order to exist.

CR and DT thus enable a transmodern dialog in a world in which many words coexist for solidary reappropriation of a theory-practical episteme engaged with the majority. With such decolonial-critical realist episteme, academics and individuals can: (a) un-covering oppressive structures of modernity in order to foster individual emancipation and a form of socialism “which is neither a market economy nor a command economy nor a mix of the two, but a genuine extension of pluralistic democracy into economic life” (Bhaskar et al. 1998, p.392); and (b) un-veiling the darker side of Eurocentric modernity/coloniality in order to foster collective liberation and engagement with an “another history [that] is coming to the forefront in which planetary and pluriversal decolonial thinking, growing since the foundational moment – 16th century – would lead the way toward a non-capitalist and imperial/colonial future” (Mignolo, 2011b: 51). From such transmodern perspective, CR dialogs with DT based on universalist mechanisms of appropriation of pluriversalist epistememes and materialities that have been made both radically invisibilized by capitalist modernity and its respective structures and discourses, including CR, and visibilized by pluriversal decoloniality, which continues to advance worldwide within and outside the corporatized neoliberal university despite increasing life-destruction risks (Dussel, 2013).

The stratified reality to be investigated by the social or socialist researcher for eventual promotion of changes via CR is composed of three levels of the real: (a) empirical, observable by human beings; (b) events, i.e. manifestations in time and space that may or may not happen at the level of the virtual, depending on the oppositions of mechanisms of the real; and (c) real or profound, consisting of powers that are often unobservable, but effective in terms of causality (Bhaskar et al., 1998). The uncovering of reality (distinct from the real) requires the visibilization of

the most profound and remote structures, denied by realistic positivism and modern science, which govern the visible reality, largely despite the ability of social actors to identify them (Fleetwood, 2005). Individuals are influenced by such structures, which precede them, but not all in the same way (Archer, 1982). For example, when primary agents are unaware of the existence of structures, they are influenced unconsciously and they reinforce such structures in their daily activities. Corporate agents may or may not be aware of these structures, but through their actions they can reinforce (morphostasis) or develop (morphogenesis) these deep structures.

Unlike what is proposed by Giddens' sociology of structuration (Whittington, 1992), CR argues that, like mind and matter, agents and structures have ontologically distinct and irreducible properties and powers (Bhaskar et al., 1998). CR dialogs hence with DT by rejecting the structure-agency conflation endorsed by dominant postmodernism and post-colonialism theories in order to deny in a particular way the totalities and materialities of capitalist modernity. Despite ignoring the fact that the universalist concepts of agency and structure reproduce the coloniality denied by modernity and lived by the majority, also in the Global North, CR validates on-going debates between DT and post-colonial theory around the ideas of colonialism as either contingent to or constitutive of modernity by emphasizing that structure and agency are not (necessarily) mutually constitutive: in sum, such CR-DT dialogue enables the legitimation of the transmodern praxis of reappropriation engaged with the majority in the North/West.

Like other emancipatory/liberating movements triggered by transmodern epistemes decoloniality can be mobilized by such structures of the stratified reality highlighted by critical realists to destabilize and reaffirm oppressive and discriminatory dynamics lived by the majority, particularly by the invisibilized, even if its academic proponents do not realize the fact. Free market discourses have been utilized by the neoliberal counterrevolution to selectively decolonize the field of Administration/Management by means of dynamics of market-centric (re)colonization. In other words, this decolonial-critical realist episteme we put forward in this article enables the recognition by the majority that privileged agents can mobilize decoloniality and DT in the emerging South-East, both in geographic North and South (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018), to recolonize. By means of counter-hegemonic and alter-hegemonic dynamics subordinated to counterrevolutionary dynamics (Lipton, 2017), the decolonial agenda may contribute to recolonization (Mbembe, 2016) and consequent regeneration of the neo-liberal counterrevolution against the majority (Crouch, 2011), evolving towards a global populist neofascism (Sousa Santos, 2018).

The iceberg metaphor helps to de-invisibilize mismatches between what is known and "visibilized-invisibilized" through types of knowledge and knowers (the visible part of the iceberg); and the invisible side of the iceberg, represented by deeper dimensions of the stratified real lived by the majority, which have been invisibilized by modern science and reproductive/regenerative mechanisms of coloniality in general (including CR and DT). The invisible side lived in particular by the 'invisibilized' is equivalent to "[...] practices that go 'unnoticed' in the eyes of management/administration, including the view of academics. This 'unnoticed' factor has generally been repressed, violated, silenced, marginalized and demarcated as 'other,' and, therefore, considered as sub-scientific by radicalized modernity" (Carrieri & Correia, 2020: 61).

While CR promotes the invisibilization of stratified reality by means of the criterion of plausibility and inter-subjectivity with a universalist purpose of emancipation, DT "un-veils" the *longue durée* of racialist coloniality embodied by capitalist modernity – i.e., the darker and



constitutive side of modernity – and re-articulations that are systematically denied by modernity in their mainstream and critical versions (including CR) in order to promote pluriversalist liberation (Mignolo, 2011a). Decolonial accounts are often enunciated at the expense of concerns about plausibility and inter-subjectivity from a South-North perspective, and with reproductive structures of stratified reality. This feature might impact the agency of both critical and decolonial researchers and lead to unintended consequences (Archer, 1982). It has been argued that due to the commitment of DT with the liberation of the colonized from Eurocentric modernity, drawing upon a conceptual rather than praxistic standpoint (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018), researchers tend to visibilize reality from a dominant “us” versus “them”, “theory versus “practice”, and “South” versus “North” perspective (Domingues, 2009).

This practical-theoretical remark is particularly relevant because the dominant conceptualization in DT argues that critical knowledge in general, and CR in particular, is problematic for liberation since it fosters the visibilization of stratified reality by means of the criteria of plausibility and inter-subjectivity informed by commitment to universalist emancipation. Unlike Eurocentric critique, DT claims to foster pluriversalist liberation from modernist conceptualizations and knowledge by unveiling the *longue durée* of rearticulations of coloniality – i.e., the darker and constitutive side of Eurocentric modernity – which are systematically denied by both mainstream and critical knowledge (including CR). From the perspective of the majority engaged with the mobilization of transmodern praxis of solidary reappropriation such conceptual/analytical differentiation between liberation and emancipation might invisibilize both on-going dynamics of liberation-emancipation mobilized by the majority on a global scale and increasingly radical dynamics of appropriation-containment of these alternatives mobilized by counterrevolutionary neoliberalism against the majority, in particular against the life of the invisibilized other. Moreover, this might preclude South-North transmodern dialogues by unintentionally reinforcing justifications for the classification of decolonial episteme as essentialism/separatism within an increasingly unequal, heterogeneous North/West (Boatcă, 2015). In sum, the decolonial-critical realist episteme put forward in this article enable researchers and invisibilized others recognize that the analytical conceptualizations provided by CR and DT are mobilized in practice by both the majority in everyday liberation-emancipation dynamics and the heteropatriarchal racist capitalism in the rearticulation of dynamics against the majority in the South/East and North/West.

With a focus on the des-invisibilization of dynamics of liberation-emancipation enabled by the transmodern praxis of solidary reappropriation, the episteme put forward in this article is used for the investigation of how neoimperial dynamics underpinning the neoliberal counter-revolution have been virtually invisibilized in the field of Management/Administration and how to restore conditions for the co-construction of a more public field engaged with the majority and expanded relevance. Before turning to the investigation of appropriation-containment and visibilization-invisibilization dynamics in the next sections, we present a simplified view of the decolonial-critical realist framework in Figure 1 below.

Table 1  
Transmodern South-North Framework

	Critical Realism	Decoloniality
Main conceptual characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discover and distinguish visible and invisible constituents of the stratified reality; the discovery of causal mechanisms invisibilized by modern science (including the field of management/administration) requires continuous vertical de-invisibilization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Un-veil lasting dynamics of coloniality denied by Eurocentric modernity and its radical rearticulation on a global scale by neo-imperial neoliberalism (including the field of management/administration and Eurocentric critiques of Eurocentrism)</li> </ul>
On dynamics of <i>visibilization/invisibilization</i> via market/non-market discourses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The epistemic visibilization of Market and non-market invisibilizes the stratified reality and enable privileged agents to shape reality through invisibilization of critical-decolonial dynamics of liberation-emancipation on a global scale which coexist with radicalization of counterrevolutionary mechanisms of appropriation-containment against the majority.</li> <li>The radicalization of coloniality in the North/West and of respective dynamics anti-essentialism/separatism dynamics of appropriation-containment hyper-visibilize market discourses and invisibilize to researchers and the majority the growing relevance of transmodern praxis of solidarity reappropriation on a global scale.</li> </ul>	
On restoring of a more public field engaged with the majority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research-beyond-science might discover the invisibilized levels of stratified reality by means of a liberating-emancipating expanded criterion of plausibility and intersubjectivity engaged with the majority, from a theoretical-practical perspective which recognizes both DT and CR as epistemes-materialities of emancipation-decolonization and oppression-colonization.</li> <li>Research engaged with the majority might recognize and des-invisibilize coexisting dynamics, such as liberation-emancipation and decolonization-recolonization, which underpin the historical coexistence of a field of Management/Administration engaged with the majority with a dominating field predominantly against the majority.</li> </ul>	

Source: Elaborated by the authors.

## Counterrevolutionary dynamics of visibilization/invisibilization

Triggered by (re-)Westernizing dynamics against essentialisms informed by radical appropriation-containment mechanisms with a focus on dewesternization and decolonization dynamics from the South-East contemporary postmodern literature argues that social objects or phenomena previously colonized by modernist theories such as “organization” or “market,”

“[...] are not natural phenomena existing in the realm of the real. Instead, like the idea of stellar “constellations,” they are a product of our own unconscious “will to order.” [...] [...] The idea that reality, as we know it, is socially constructed has become a commonly accepted claim. [...] [...] social reality is systematically constructed, sustained and modified (Chia, 2009: 111).

This postmodern turn does not tell us that neo-imperial counter-revolutionary neoliberalism and its supremacist market discourse are re-Westernizing constructions against not only the “irresponsible” rise of the Third World and emerging societies of the South/ East, but also against the solidarity resurgence of a majority of discriminated racialized people, who are seen as

“insurgents” or “sub-scientific” individuals to be kept invisibilized/subalternized in both South-East and North-West (Boatcă, 2015). This picture is illustrated by the invisibilization promoted by the neoliberal university concerning the Black Power Civil Rights movement in the US, which was triggered by anti-colonial movements of liberation in Africa interconnected with solidarity emancipation of “political minorities” in the US within and outside the Eurocentric university (Joseph, 2006).

This solidarity movement and corresponding transmodern epistemes were violently appropriated and contained in the 1970s in the US through counterrevolutionary dynamics of university neo-liberalization aimed at “to undermine the promise of the university as a site of radical and anticolonial transformation” (Kamola, 2019: 303), which was over-visibility by the “1968 worldwide revolution” (Wallerstein, 2009: 118) supported by knowledge/epistemes that keep liberating and emancipating invisibilized collectivities in the South-East and in the North-West (see Sousa Santos, 2018; Connell, 2007). The neo-liberalization of public universities and the hyper-visibility of market-oriented neoliberal universities as anti-essentialism organizations continue to help to invisibilize decolonizing and dewesternizing dynamics for a non-capitalist or socialist future within and outside universities (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). We can highlight the Occupy and the Black Lives Matter movements, both connected to the Zapatista Revolution in the 1990s in Chiapas, southern Mexico (Higgins, 2004), and which, in the North/West, have promoted the regeneration of decolonial struggles and transmodern developments inaugurated with the discovery-invasion of the Americas by European conquerors starting in 1492 (Dussel, 2013).

In the context of the Cold War, the anti-communism discourses of sovereign consumer and free market against the Eurocentric state and state-centric theories constituted the neoliberal revolution led by white US supremacy to inhibit the rise of “multiple minorities” of the invisibilized, who occupied and partially decolonized the predominantly white university in the heart of the capitalist/patriarchal/racist Empire (Joseph, 2006), and regain the US global hegemony lost during the revolutionary 1960-70s triggered by worldwide dewesternizing and decolonizing dynamics (Steger & Roy, 2010). As one of the main institutions of these counterrevolutionary dynamics of invisibilization-visibility via market discourse, business schools and government schools – strategically delinked from the predominantly white Eurocentric university undergoing processes of decolonization followed by radical recolonization (Joseph, 2006) – universalized the supremacist discourse that it was up to the US to mobilize every means possible to contain the expansion of the communist empire within the country and abroad, as well as statisms and developmentalisms, linked to the Third World and resurging essentialist/separatist agendas (van Elteren, 2003).

This ethno-nationalist market discourse mobilized by a vast elitist epistemic-military complex (Parmar, 2019) made selected “enemies” (of democracy, of freedom, etc.) visible – i.e., the “authoritarian state” and corresponding oppressive Eurocentric forces/theories – by means of dynamics of appropriation-containment of epistemes e materialities, which seduced many on a global scale (Plehwe et al., 2007). By hyper-visibility this counterrevolutionary discourse within and outside the corporatized neoliberal university, the field helped to invisibilize transmodern developments grounded on the praxis of reappropriation and structures of radicalization of coloniality against the majority, in particular to academics in both South and North (Ibarra-Colado, 2006). The simultaneous visibility of the “market” and the “enemy” made viable the institutionalization of the logic of the benevolent empire on multiple fronts, helping to replace

critical historical consciousness in the US, which had been reactivated by transmodern movements such as Black Power Civil Rights (Joseph, 2006), and reaffirming the supremacy of positivism, recaptured by the increasingly less public anti-essentialism/separatism neoliberal university (Giroux, 2011). Management was thus visibilized as a voluntarist theory-practice, which was linked to democracy and the freedom of the individual, especially against anti-Americanism forces.

The historiography of neoliberalism produced by the neoliberal university in a supposedly post-modern post-colonial society virtually erased from the collective memory the theories-practices of anti-colonialism and anti-racism for/by the majority, mobilized by emerging societies in the South-East engages with the transmodern praxis of solidary reappropriation, which went beyond the theory vs practice and First vs. Third World binarisms, supported by post-modern dynamics of appropriation-containment of emerging epistemes, which were promoted in the US with the incorporation of postmodern and postcolonial theories by the neoliberal university (Young, 2001). This sub-theorizing of the market driven by a colonialist-racist-patriarchal structure of reality also appropriates and contains transmodern statist theories of political economy, which would become known as dependency theory in the context of 1960-70 world revolution, both in the South/East and in the North/West (Martins, 2011). Projects of selective decolonization were mobilized by the predominantly white university, which was partially decolonized in the Global North during the 1960-70s (Maldonado-Torres, 2008) through intersectional movements led by the Black Power Civil Rights Movement (Joseph, 2006). Invisibilized by the “official story” these movements which created conditions for co-construction of a field engaged with the majority echoed decolonization dynamics within and outside the university in Revolutionary Cuba (Guevara & Waters, 2000), South Africa (Oyedemi, 2018), Brazil (Tavares & Gomes, 2020) and other countries in the South-East.

With the announced purpose of freeing populations from authoritarian states, poverty, and oppressive theories the privileged advocates of GNC and market discourse in the neoliberal university and its increasingly corporatized management/business schools visibilized ideas from theorists who had until then been virtually unknown, such as von Mises and Milton Friedman (Khurana, 2010; Murphy & Willmott, 2015). It was portrayed in academic and non-academic medias as a revolution “in the field of ideas” which resulted of the “victory of a disinterested intellectual movement over its adversaries” (Murphy & Willmott, 2015: 36). The invisible side of this highly contested counterrevolution that informed the institutionalization of a field of Management/Administration against the majority was mobilized mainly by corporations from the financial sector and the media supported by the neo-imperial military-economic might led by the US (Duménil & Lévy, 2007), multicultural epistemic dynamics in the South/East and North/West (van Elteren, 2003) and mechanisms for radical co-optation of alternatives and transmodern epistemes in different corners of the planet (Hong, 2015).

Such dynamics of invisibilization-visibilization driven by counterrevolutionary dynamics of appropriation-containment inform the extraordinary regenerative ability of neoliberalism that researchers in the North-West continue to misunderstand (Crouch, 2011). By visibilizing the market-oriented neoliberal state in the name of good democratic governance, market-centric discourse invisibilized the multiple faces of public administration in the US, and also in the emerging South-East (Farazmand, 1999; Guerreiro-Ramos, 1981; Kipping et al., 2008) – in particular the market-oriented Chinese socialist state (Zhang & Ong, 2008). According to David Harvey’s neo-Marxist

criticism, the US-led neoliberal state mobilizes a complex apparatus invisibilized by the “minimal state” market-centered discourse, “which fundamental mission was to facilitate conditions for profitable capital accumulation on the part of both domestic and foreign capital” (Harvey, 2007: 7). With the conceptual distinction between emancipation and liberation restored by the increasingly hierarchical and fragmented neoliberal university critical North/West authors in the field of management (e.g. Alvesson & Willmott, 1992) kept invisibilized in the North/West the colonialist/racist/patriarchal face of neoliberalism mobilized by masculinist white supremacy (Allen, 2001), which has been visibilized by decolonial authors in the South and North subjected to radicalization of anti-separatism mechanisms of coloniality (Ibarra-Colado, 2006; Prasad, 2015).

According to decolonial literature, this picture materializes the worldwide radicalization of Eurocentric coloniality, which began in 1492, when America (imposed on Abya Yala) was “discovered” and “conquered” by Europeans for the salvation of ahistorical peoples and soulless sub-human natives (Dussel, 1993). As a focus on the authoritarian Eurocentric state, neoliberal counterrevolution appropriates the allegedly “insurgent” and “identity” decolonial episteme by means of privileged agents and institutions that supposedly engage the majority to reinforce, rework and reproduce deeply stratified structures against the majority (Archer, 1982). In short, counter-revolutionary neoliberalism subalternizes and incentivizes pluriversal decoloniality by means of the radicalization of historical decolonization-recolonization dynamics against the majority in both South-East and North-West (Faria & Hemais, 2020). In the 19th century, France and England appropriated and contained solidary transmodern epistemologies mobilized by Europeans and ‘natives’ in interconnected contexts of liberation-emancipation praxis at colonies and metropolises to foster the selective decolonization of Portuguese and Spanish colonies simultaneously with the mobilization of Eurocentric mechanisms of recolonization at colonies and metropolises led by France, Germany and England; in the 20th century, the US headed post-Eurocentric dynamics of the decolonization-recolonization of English and French colonies (Mignolo, 2011a: 51-52), including dramatic simultaneous interventions in Vietnam and the US, against an increasing solidary majority supposedly subordinated to separatist/essentialist agendas (Statler, 2007).

The emblematic Chilean “11 de septiembre” in 1973, instigated by the military coup led by Augusto Pinochet, marked the post-Eurocentric neoliberal recolonization of Latin America via the experimentation of a counter-revolution in the region that was secretly promoted and financed by local elites and carried out militarily by the US (Harvey, 2006). The anti-communism coup operated a violent anti-statism response of containment – with domestic repercussions – of the rise of the South-East on a global scale, driven not only by socialist globalization spearheaded mainly by the Soviet Union (Sklair, 2011), but also by eastern globalization (Pieterse, 2004) and decolonial globalization (Márquez & Rana, 2017).

In Chile, through Pinochet and the Chicago Boys, due to an exchange agreement between the Catholic University of Chile and the University of Chicago in 1956, militarized discourses and practices were created and transformed into academic theories to combat a ‘dangerous’ essentialization of communist eurocentrism in the American continent. A ‘local’ field of administration engaged with the majority – a field informed by Marxist, popular and decolonial theories-practices – was selectively decolonized starting with violent neoliberalization of the university in Chile (Mandiola & Varas, 2018) during the most critical period of the so-called Inter-American Cold War (Harmer, 2011). The market discourses visibilized an alleged market-centered

democracy driven by the miracle of “market orientation” as social progress in a supposedly Latin American country without history, in the words of Henry Kissinger, and invisibilized the growth of violence, racism, censorship and social inequality. The Chicago Boys led a “revolutionary project from within civil society” (Clark, 2017: 7) based on violent dynamics of appropriation-containment during Pinochet’s dictatorship, which informed the selective “decolonization” of various fields such as economics, public administration and development administration, which emerged in Latin America, triggered by transmodern dependency theories partially engaged with the majority which became known worldwide in spite of severe attacks (Larrain, 1991) and by contested democratic decolonial socialism in the region (Mandiola & Varas, 2018).

This grand material-discursive intervention in the Global South-East radicalized the invisibilization of governmental structures in the market visibilized by transmodern dependency theories (dos Santos, 1970). Such dynamics inform both the viability and the unfeasibility of a field of Management/Administration engaged with the majority. They also inform the containment of a neoliberal post-Eurocentrism by means of radical rearticulation of positivism and its variants in management in the US, in general, and in the areas of marketing and strategic management, in particular; correspondingly, they also inform the ongoing neo-colonialist rearticulations of New Public Management (NPM) (Pollitt, 2016). Within an increasingly stratified global reality, such dynamics have helped to make NPM more heterogeneous or diversified by means of appropriation-containment of “local” transmodern theories-practices engaged with the majority triggered by dynamics of dewesternization and decolonization in the emerging South-East (Pollitt, 2016; Terry, 1998). The hyper-visibilization of the market, through key concepts in the field of management, helps to invisibilize both the mobilization of transmodern praxis of solidary appropriation underpinning dynamics of co-construction of a field of management/administration otherwise engaged with a heterogeneous majority struggling for liberation-emancipation and the accelerated growth of a population of invisibilized who resist and struggle against privileged agents and an increasingly stratified reality in both South/East and North/West. This counterrevolutionary dynamic – more specifically, this surprisingly successful sub-theorization against a management field engaged with the majority and, in particular, against the modernization of Public Administration – is illustrated by the aberrant ascension of the concept of market orientation (OM) in marketing and non-market in strategic management, as investigated in the next section.

## **Radical Containment of Management/Administration Engaged with the Majority**

By means of invisibilized radicalization of dynamics of appropriation-containment against the possibility of co-construction of a field of Management/Administration engaged with the majority market-centrism has promoted counter-revolutionary reforms in various organizations, especially the increasingly less public corporatized university and its business schools. The militarized face of neoliberalism has been invisibilized by the supremacist market discourse as from the 1970s and has promoted selective decolonization-recolonization interventions in the name of a market-oriented anti-communist university, which would thus guarantee individual freedom and national/global security (Faria & Hemais, 2020). Business schools were thus appropriated by market-centered populism, which made the market synonymous with democracy (Kotler, 1972) and drove the great structural offensive of capital against dewesternizing, decolonial dynamics in the emerging South-

East. As one of the most important disciplines of the US anti-communist offensive during the Cold War at home and abroad, (Tadajewski & Saren, 2008), marketing embraced the institutionalized market-centrism by means of the soft power strategies of the benevolent empire and the Washington Consensus, and helped to erase from the collective memory the possibility of a field of management/administration engaged with the majority.

In the early 1990s the area of marketing reaffirmed a crucial geo-historical role in structural amnesia dynamics that began during the Cold War (Tadajewski & Saren, 2008). The “strange” rise of the market orientation (MO) concept (Henderson, 1998), accompanied by extraordinary invisibilization of the extraordinary success achieved by the market-oriented liberalism with Chinese characteristics (Harvey, 2007), has helped to visibilize and universalize the counterrevolutionary representation of the market as the only interpretation of reality within and outside universities and management and government schools. Enunciated as a definitive antidote against the enemies of market democracy, this extraordinarily de-theorized MO concept paved a manufactured trajectory of meteoric rise that was unprecedented in the history of the discipline (e.g. Day, 2001; Deshpandé, Farley, & Webster, 1993). Triggered by the contested re-Westernizing “end of history” concept (Fukuyama, 1989), influential authors and institutions have argued that MO has brought marketing to its zenith in terms of theory and practice, in parallel with the surprising advancement of equally de-theorized concept of non-market in strategic management (see Faria & Abdalla, 2014). Together, these two concepts have boosted counterrevolutionary dynamics of neoliberal decolonization-recolonization of Management and Public Management, both in the North-West and the South-East. Together these concepts have fostered the invisibilization of the radicalization of the constitutive interconnections between public and private promoted and demanded by the GNC, visibilized since the 1950s by means of transmodern theories-practices linked to nationalism, developmentalism and socialism in the Third World (Furtado, 1959) and also in the US (Mills, 1956).

The “visibilization” of the emancipatory/revolutionary side of the market and the non-market, for the majority and against it at the same time, has been anchored, among other things, in the hyper-managerial literature, which exuded the Americanist euphoria of victory in World War II and in the Cold War. In marketing/business schools, hyper-managerialism reactivated the anti-communist agenda of ideological sub-theorizing in the Cold War led by marketing. The idea propagated by the management field that a limitless MO would correct the remaining non-market was first hyper-visibilized by political leaders of market fundamentalism in the public sphere – in particular Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan – which declared the bankruptcy of the State, society and community together with political minorities underpinned by essentialism/separatism, which have informed “insurgent” ideas within a field of public administration engaged with the majority (Stivers, 2007). The remarkably “shallow” research in MO published by rather unknown authors such as Kohli, Jaworski, Narver and Slater have empowered many academics in their quest to professional ascension within the market-oriented increasingly less public neoliberal university without ties to the past, hyper-visibilizing this way in business schools the supremacist idea that the market and individuals became free from the oppressive authoritarian state after the US victory against communist imperialism – i.e. the end of history.

From the 1990s onwards, ideological concepts such as MO have been mobilized by the neoliberal university and its business schools for an even more radical fight hyper-visibilized by the idea that the North/West has experienced not the end of history, but rather an “inevitable” and

unprecedented clash of civilizations driven by the rise of the South-East on a global scale (Huntington, 1993). In short, OM and non-market concepts mobilized by a field of management contrary to the majority constitute radical counterrevolutionary responses by Americanist white supremacy to essentialist/barbaric threats within and outside the university, threats driven by the resurgence of decolonial epistemes and restoring of transmodern praxis of solidary reappropriation from the 1990s onwards (Grosfoguel, 2008).

Both concepts legitimize the minimization of public administration services, which are essential for the racialized majority in the US (Marable, 2015) and the anti-imperialist rise of countries and societies in the South-East (Harvey, 2006, 2013b). Management academia have disseminated, on a global scale, and with the support of proponents of the contested Washington Consensus, the belief, traversed by positivist science in management, that the non-market is an anomaly that is widespread in emerging, ex-communist and ex-Third World countries, which have continued to follow statist policies, with special emphasis on China and its geopolitical incursions via state capitalism in Africa, Latin America and the US (Barney, 2005; Burton, 2005; Doh, Lawton & Rajwani, 2012). As a counterrevolutionary response focused on dynamics of dewesternization/decoloniality and alternatives in the composition of a post-imperial (Wade, 2010) or pluriversal world order (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018), and on the popularization of the discourse that these countries and corresponding statisms could represent a serious threat to global market capitalism (Faria, 2015; Glosny, 2010), dynamics of decolonization-colonization focused on “public administration” became radicalized, starting with the global crisis of 2007-2008, led by populist-discriminatory oligarchies connected with “market” ideas radically opposed to the majority imposed by Wall Street.

According to strategic management literature, the non-market concept is subordinate to the market, described as a sphere of actors (main and supporting) that interact in processes of economic and non-economic exchange (Baron, 1995a, 1995b, 2013). This counterrevolutionary literature attributes the non-market to the non-economic or threatening “popular” – i.e., disguised authoritarian statisms and lurking colonists, illustrated by the China-led BRICS countries, in which irresponsible authoritarian leaders “have embraced the capitalist system not only in order to maximize economic performance in their countries but also with the aim of promoting their political goals and furthering their political dominance (Bremmer, 2010: 249), inside and outside their countries – subalternizing state agencies, communities and governments, in addition to public administration through permanent dynamics of appropriation-containment on behalf of market-centric management in all organizations (Bach & Allen, 2010; Boddewyn, 2003). This non-market conceptualization – with spelling and semantics prefixed by negation – points to a dual dynamic of appropriation-containment and subalternization of invisibilized individuals, one fostered by the neoliberal counter-revolution in its renewed versions. The negation – (non) – prefix renders the semantics contrary to the liberating virtues of the market and, consequently, to other terms seen as insurgent or separatist, preferred by rising powers and the “invisibilized” who comprise a potentially threatening majority on global scale terms, such as anti-capitalism, anti-Americanism or anti-Westernization. This neo-imperial conceptualization in management/administration radicalizes the invisibilization of the majority on a global scale.

This counterrevolutionary radicalization embodied by the field of Management/Administration against the majority has become one of the conditions for the success



of male white supremacy and the successive crises of GNC. The field still has to help contain alternative market theories mobilized by countries in the emerging South-East, more specifically China (Arrighi, 2009), and also by an increasing invisibilized majority potentially engaged with the transmodern praxis of solidary reappropriation also in the Global North, as illustrated by the Occupy and Black Lives Matter movements (Rickford, 2016). Moreover, the field still has to help with the invisibilization of the radical mobilization of hard power – i.e., power based on coercion and economic incentives (Nye, 2004) – triggered by the rise and normalization of US unilateralism after the events of 9/11 and the invasion of Iraq in 2003 and, correspondingly, the radical militarization of the “market” on a global scale (Harvey, 2006, 2007). Despite the supposed minimization of the State, the government and, consequently, the public administration, and the scope of relevance in the field of Management/Administration, the imperial State’s institutional protection of the conventional and nuclear weapons “markets” is well-known (Barley, 2010) invisibilized by an increasing number of “invisible enemies” from 9/11 onwards, and the corresponding institutionalization of the global war on terror within and outside the learning institution (Rajagopal, 2004).

As suggested by the decolonial-critical realist framework put forward in this paper, to make visible in decolonial, social or socialist research what is behind the consumer and market sovereignty discourse in the North Atlantic is not feasible for many, especially for scholars at the increasingly monitored and controlled neoliberal university. The visibilization of such structures – i.e., the darker side of modernity systematically denied by modernity (Ibarra-Colado, 2006), which informs the contested hegemony of the white/colonialist curriculum in management (Contu, 2019) and the ongoing constitutive racism in business schools in the Global North (Dar et al, 2020) – for the purpose of reengaging the majority in Management/Administration, can be seen not as good science, but exemplarily as epistemic rebelliousness/disobedience. Carrieri and Correia (2020) reaffirm such arguments by criticizing the processes of exclusion and silencing imposed on the majority by a minority by means of legitimate forms of communication, including the learning institution itself.

In the UK, Henderson (1998) expressed isolated criticism of the obvious superficiality in the causal relations between MO and corporate performance in the US. Instead of questioning in depth the sub-theorizing of the market in management, the author defended the interruption of research in MO. Within an increasingly uneven, heterogeneous and discriminatory Global North, in which intellectual activism in the neoliberal university and its management schools has become virtually impossible (Rhodes, 2018), a South-North dialogue informed by an emancipation-liberation agenda engaged with the majority tends to be framed as trace of a dangerous potential return to essentialisms/separatisms against the expected evolving of an Eurocentric world toward a virtuous postcolonial world (Cornelissen & Höllerer, 2020). It is not surprising hence that Henderson was somehow silent or silenced in what regards the invisibilized radicalization of coloniality in the North-West that began in the 1990s (Dussel, 2013), triggered by the neoliberal counterrevolution grounded on the supremacist idea of ‘market orientation’ that has been since then reaffirmed and contested in various parts of both North-West and South-East (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; Sousa Santos, 2018). Such radical contention of a field engaged with the majority invisibilizes not only alternatives underpinned by transmodern epistemes, but in particular ‘invisibilized others’ from whom it has been denied the right to belong to and reappropriate the field from a more public perspective of relevance. The needed de-subalternization of invisibilized others is addressed in the

next section.

## **De-subalternization of the Invisibilized and Expansion of South-North Dialogue**

For the privileged proponents of counterrevolutionary neoliberalism, it has not been sufficient shaping fields of knowledge against a growing and heterogeneous majority engaged with diverse alternatives which coexist with modern heteropatriarchal capitalism – such as non-capitalism, post-capitalism, communitarianism, socialism, post-socialism and corresponding transmodern epistemes and materialities. For its expansion by means of extractive dynamics of appropriation-containment. It is also necessary to subalternize invisibilized other historically involved in liberation struggles and epistemes – i.e., the undesirable whose “life can be disallowed to the point of death” (Melamed, 2006) – and hence continuously divide the majority.

For example, starting with experience acquired in Chile, an increasingly less public field of public administration promoted radical counterrevolutionary reforms in the US triggered by market-centric NPM discourse against ‘separatists’. Inside and outside the university, trickle-down reforms fostered appropriation and containment of material-epistemic possessions of the majority in general, and in particular of the ‘barbarious’ Mapuche, also called ‘araucanos’ by the Spanish (Richards, 2010) – i.e., the equivalent in Chile of the weaker, poorer and darker other in the US (Rodriguez, 2008) subalternized by a benevolent neoliberal multiculturalism that rearticulates the divide-to-rule strategy applied to Native Americans and African Americans in the US (King et al., 2020) by appropriating anti-racism and decolonial epistemes and materialities in order to justify and invisibilize racist/colonialist interventions commanded by US-led transnational capital at home and abroad (Melamed, 2006). This transnational/multicultural facet of neoliberal divide-and-rule counterrevolution embodied by business schools (Dar et al, 2020) and colonial/race-blind management education (Nkomo, 1992) reaffirms the colonialist/racist idea that the invisibilized ‘other’ stuck to ‘identitarian monoculturalism’ or other cultural-historical deficiencies (Melamed, 2006) is not only inferior, but also a threat to the majority which constitutes the allegedly post-colonial post-racist multicultural society. In tandem with attempts of public administration in the South-East to engage the majority by rejecting the “uncritical adoption of the international prescription in favor of NPM” (Peci et al., 2008: 52), counterrevolutionary multicultural neoliberalism radicalized the subalternization of the invisibilized other through the contested globalization of US-led NPM (Pollitt, 2016) and diversity management discourses (Nkomo & Hoobler, 2014).

While the subalternized poor in the North Atlantic is invisibilized by neoliberal benevolent multiculturalism discourses and reforms aimed to discipline the ‘separatist’ racialized other domestically (Soss et al., 2011) and enable benevolent interventions abroad, market and non-market counterrevolutionary discourse visibilizes the “poor” in emerging regions of the South-East as ‘inferior/threatening other’ and the invisibilization of alternatives, taken as potential insurgency or even global terrorism (see Lawton & Rajwani, 2015). Issues that were crucial for the State and for this invisibilized other engaged with respective transmodern theories-practices, have been appropriated and visibilized by the neoliberal university and its business schools as “non-market” issues to be solved by corporate activism and private politics needed to the ascension of emerging

societies and communities with supremacist market-centrism provided by the multiculturalist benevolent empire in the form of ‘international’ or ‘global’ strategic management knowledge (e.g., Baron, 2013).

According to this US-led strategic management literature, non-market and poverty continue to abound in emerging and transition countries, still colonized by authoritarian/essentialist statisms and engaged with ‘bad multiculturalism’ and populist management of the poor supported with counterrevolutionary anti-imperialist or decolonial discourses (Lipton, 2017); non-market is hence a ‘necessary evil’, and particularly dangerous to the West, which must be replaced, in one way or another, by the free market (Faria & Abdalla, 2014). It is hence needed and justified the support of decolonizing-recolonizing management theories produced by the multicultural benevolent empire (Walsh, 2015) which reaffirm the contested impossibility of the university as both a democratic public sphere (Giroux, 2007) and “a site of radical and anticolonial transformation” (Kamola, 2019: 303).

With the institutionalization of the counterrevolutionary idea that “the business of society is business” (Sklair, 1997: 519), triggered by management/business schools, the field has radicalized the mobilization of multiculturalism dynamics on a global scale focused on growing heterogeneous population potentially engaged with ‘separatist’ alternatives underpinned by barbarian appropriations of a supposedly postcolonial modernity within an increasingly unequal, heterogeneous and discriminatory Global North (Boatcă, 2015).

The increasingly ‘global’ or ‘international’ area of strategic management (Baron, 1995a, 1995b, 2013) hence invisibilizes all alternatives connected to non-capitalism, post-socialism, socialism, and post-capitalism by visibilizing the all-inclusive non-market as an umbrella concept in emerging societies in transition to US-led global capitalism; more importantly, it invisibilizes both the existence of an alternative “strategic management” engaged with the majority, as well as neo-imperial benevolent interventions in the both South-East and North-West championed by large corporations, transnational capital, and white male supremacy (Parmar, 2019; Doh et al., 2012). Triggered by dynamics of dewesternization and decolonization invisibilized by the US-led field of management/administration, researchers from the South insist on restoring the transmodern praxis of reappropriation in order to visibilize and de-subalternize invisibilized others engaged with alternatives to neo-imperial neoliberalism (Quelha de Sá & Costa, 2019; Carrieri et al., 2020) in line with authors from the East, who insist on visibilizing the oriental globalization of state capitalism and market socialism (Amin, 2013).

This racist subalternization of the invisibilized other on a global scale has been underscored and justified by the ungovernable emergence of the market-oriented socialist neoliberalism with Chinese characteristics (Harvey, 2007) and corresponding non-white dynamics of counter-hegemonic globalization of market socialism (Sklair, 2011) and equally ungovernable of decolonization/dewesternization. This warfare counter-revolutionary strategy has been supported by dynamics of epistemic-material institutionalization of US-led ideological-cultural consumerism on a global scale together with the normalization of indifference of the individual as sovereign consumer toward the needs, suffering and the right to live of invisibilized others (Faria & Hemais, 2020).

The co-construction of a field engaged with the majority in general, and with the invisibilized

other in particular, requires restoring everyday solidarity, within and outside the university, in opposition to the normalized celebration “of the freedom of each one to pursue his own interests and well-being, without being responsible for the interests or well-being of any other individual” (Giroux, 2014: 3). Such solidary de-subalternization of the invisibilized other requires reinforcing everyday dynamics against the US-led normalization of “a policy of disengagement and a culture of irresponsibility” (Giroux, 2014: 6) which enhances the “political impotence of contemporary subjectivity” (Berardi, 2019: 9) and hence fragments and polarizes the majority on a global scale.

Transmodern frameworks, as much as DT and CR individually, both embody the everyday life of the majority and feed and justify counterrevolutionary dynamics of appropriation-containment against the majority on a global scale – in particular against the life of the invisibilized ‘separatist’ other. Accordingly, the restoring of the praxis of reappropriation in management/administration needs to be cautious since such arsenal of warfare dynamics against the majority in general, and in particular against the invisibilized other, have been fostered by US-led offensive extractive radicalization of transnational capital and militarism, with increasing participation of nationalist (White, 2002) and post-communist anti-colonial elites (Eyal et al., 1997). The cautious restoring of the transmodern praxis of solidary reappropriation, together with radical de-subalternization of the invisibilized other, demands expansion of South-North dialogue put forward in this article. In line with our framework we suggest the promotion of dialogues with theories-practices not belonging to DT or CR and respective commitments with liberation and emancipation. Triggered by dynamics of dewesternization, rewesternization, and decolonization, which exist despite their identification, several fields of knowledge empowered by Eurocentric dynamics of appropriation-containment which enable anti-essentialism/separatism extractive conversion of transmodern epistemes into academic knowledge in the North/West (e.g. economic sociology, political economy, geography) have promoted relevant debates around the US-led neoliberal conceptualization of free market (Arrighi, 2009; Fligstein, 2002; Harvey, 2013a; Peck, 2005). For example, in economic sociology and political economy, the market is not distinguished from the non-market, both being dynamically comprised of actors and structures, processes and social relations (Levy et al., 2003).

Authors visibilize sociopolitical relations invisibilized by the dominant discourse and discriminatory materialities lived by invisibilized others living everyday liberation-emancipation radical struggles and the co-construction of a field engaged with the majority. States, governments, legislators, public administration, NGOs, communities and citizens are portrayed as active actors with different levels of individual or collective agency (Fligstein, 2002), in opposition to anti-public/anti-popular assumptions imposed on a global scale by US-led neo-imperial neoliberalism in transition to neofascist populism. The strategic reappropriation of this set of marginalized theories-practices outside the scope of DT and CR is hence necessary for the solidary majority in global scale to counter anti-essentialism/separatism rearticulations on behalf of the ‘poor’ and the ‘racialized other’, allegedly against economic inequality, mobilized by the benevolent neoliberal empire by means of increasingly radical dynamics of visibilization-invisibilization and appropriation-containment.

## **Discussion and Concluding Considerations**

In response to the radicalization of discriminations and inequalities on a global scale

championed by the neoliberal counterrevolution of capitalist heteropatriarchal modernity in transition to populist neo-fascism we argue in this article that a field of Management/Administration engaged with the majority requires the restoring of South-North dialogues between epistemes and materialities committed with decolonial liberation and critical realist emancipation, within and outside the university and its schools of business-administration predominantly against the majority and increasingly less public, by means of the transmodern praxis of solidary reappropriation.

By means of a decolonial-critical realist framework which moves beyond North-South and theory-practice binarisms, this article suggests that emancipation and liberation are not opposite concepts, but coexistent theories-practices mobilized (effective and potentially) by a heterogeneous majority in both South/East and North/West. This article suggests that, by means of counterrevolutionary dynamics that go beyond North-South and theory-practice binarisms established by the Eurocentric modernity/coloniality, help to radically subalternize the invisibilized other engaged with alternatives and corresponding transmodern epistemes on a global scale which are invisibilized and classified as separatism/essentialism. In response, privileged actors and institutions mobilize dynamics of visibilization-invisibilization and appropriation-containment by means of a counter-revolutionary market discourse against the majority which rearticulates its lasting fragmentation and division.

This article suggests that a invisibilized field of Management/Administration engaged with the majority coexists historically with a hyper-visibilized field predominantly against the majority, this latter being triggered by anti-essentialism/separatism dynamics of capitalist visibilization-invisibilization and appropriation-containment of epistemes-materialities mobilized by the majority engaged with non-capitalism, post-capitalism, communitarianism, socialism, and post-socialism. These coexisting dynamics, which are under-investigated and invisibilized by the management-administration field led by an increasingly unequal, heterogeneous and discriminatory North/West, have helped to reaffirm the contested impossibility of the neoliberal university and its business/management schools as constituents of both the democratic public sphere and anti-colonial struggles of liberation-emancipation. Grounded on investigation and visibilization of these dynamics by means of a South-North framework that restores the transmodern praxis of solidary reappropriation, we propose that the co-construction of a field engaged with the majority might prioritize the de-subalternization of the 'non-market' and des-celebration of the 'free market' discourses through the expansion of South-North transmodern dialogue with strategic-solidary reappropriation of theories-practices produced and marginalized in the North/West which move beyond the academic boundaries set by DT and CR.

The everyday co-construction of a field engaged with the majority requires from academics the cautious, but radical, promotion of de-subalternization of invisibilized others, within and outside organizations and universities. Within such increasingly complex context of violence against an increasingly heterogeneous majority subjected to divide-to-rule strategies mobilized by benevolent multicultural neoliberalism, it is crucial that the university and its schools of management-business move beyond the counterrevolutionary strategy of treating social problems as irrelevant or inexistent (Giroux, 2015) and normalizing the individualist political impotence that fragments and polarizes the majority (Berrardi, 2019). The restoring of a more public perspective of relevance to the field through de-subalternization of the invisibilized other is needed for the solidary majority to overcome the intensification of anti-separatism/essentialism strategies in both North/West and

South/East aimed to enlarge and divide the majority and corresponding radicalization of counterrevolutionary extractivist dynamics of appropriation-containment of transmodern epistemes and materialities. This 'other' field needs to be restored and renewed through everyday co-construction with invisibilized others, not for or about them, underpinned by solidary struggles against capitalism, patriarchal and colonialist domination.

Making visible and de-subalternizing the invisibilized other means not replacing universalist Eurocentric modernity with pluriversalist decoloniality, but restoring solidary transmodern dialogues beyond North-South and theory-practice binarisms and des-invisibilization of everyday liberation-emancipation transformations inaugurated in 1492 which constitute both this 'other' field and the visibilized field that denies, appropriates and contains the former. In counterrevolutionary response to non-dialogic decolonizing movements in management/administration triggered by ungovernable dynamics of decolonization and dewesternization, we might expect the radicalization of dynamics of appropriation-containment of transmodern epistemes and materialities on a global scale by universalist dynamics against the majority, in particular against the life of the invisibilized other, championed by an increasingly less public and more militarized-corporatized neoliberal university and its schools of business-management.

The counterrevolutionary universality driven by the dynamics of visibilization-invisibilization and appropriation-containment is a constitutive dimension of pluriversity; this condition inaugurated in 1492 is illustrated in contemporary times by dynamics which enable postmodern and postcolonial theories to underpin the counterrevolutionary market discourse triggered by an increasingly offensive transnational capital and the rewesternizing regeneration of multicultural benevolent neoliberalism. The restoring of transmodern dialogues engaged with the majority enable the recognition in the South-East and North-West that CR is a marginalized episteme-materiality for embodying theories-practices of decolonial liberation and critical emancipation which are not allowed to be visibilized in an increasingly unequal, heterogeneous and discriminatory North/West and that DT is not a non-contradictory liberating totality for everyone; in a world in which diverse worlds coexist, collide and coalesce dynamics of appropriation-containment and visibilization-invisibilization are constitutive of both capitalist modernity/coloniality and pluriversal decolonial transmodernity.

By challenging the eventual romanticization of the "majority" and of the "invisible other" and hence realizing that we ourselves are a constituent part of the dynamics visibilized herein, we hope that this modest contribution, to be read by a privileged academic minority that constitutes the heterogeneous majority under growing risk, turns into a liberating-emancipating inspiration for the collective restoring, renewing, and reaffirming in both South/East and North/West of the viability of everyday co-construction of a field engaged with the majority which coexists with a field still predominantly against the majority which insists in moving beyond the dominant options – i.e., to accept neoliberal radicalization or neofascist populism (Berardi, 2019).

## References

- Abdalla, M. M., & Faria, A. (2019). Local development versus neoliberal globalization project: reflecting on market-oriented cities. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 53(1), 84-100.

doi:10.1590/0034-761220170088

- Allen, R. L. (2001). The Globalization of White Supremacy: Toward a Critical Discourse on the Racialization of the World. *Educational Theory*, 51(4), 467-485. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5446.2001.00467.x
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (1992). On the idea of emancipation in management and organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3), 432-464. doi:10.2307/258718
- Amin, S. (2013). China 2013. *Monthly Review*, 64(10), 14. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3fgjltF>
- Archer, M. S. (1982). Morphogenesis versus structuration: on combining structure and action. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 33(4), 455-483. doi:10.2307/589357
- Arrighi, G. (2009). *Adam Smith in Beijing: Lineages of the 21st Century*. New York: Verse.
- Bach, D., & Allen, D. B. (2010). What Every CEO Needs to Know About Nonmarket Strategy. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 51(3), 40-49. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3xXsCzk>
- Barley, S. R. (2010). Building an Institutional Field to Corral a Government: A Case to Set an Agenda for Organization Studies. *Organization Studies*, 31(6), 777-805. doi:10.1177/0170840610372572
- Barney, J. B. (2005). Should Strategic Management Research Engage Public Policy Debates? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6), 945-948. doi:10.5465/amj.2005.19573092
- Baron, D. P. (1995a). The Nonmarket Strategy System. *Sloan Management Review*, 37(1), 73. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3b9wIzS>
- Baron, D. P. (1995b). Integrated Strategy: Market and Nonmarket Components. *California Management Review*, 37(2), 47-65. doi:10.2307/41165788
- Baron, D. P. (2013). *Business and its environment* (7th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Berardi, F. (2019). *Futurability: The Age of Impotence and the Horizon of Possibility*. New York: Verso.
- Bhaskar, R. (2008). *A Realist Theory of Science*. London: Routledge.
- Boatcă, M. (2015). *Global inequalities beyond occidentalism*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Boddewyn, J. J. (2003). Understanding and Advancing the Concept of 'Nonmarket'. *Business & Society*, 42(3), 297-327. doi:10.1177/0007650303257504
- Bremmer, I. (2010). Article Commentary: The End of the Free Market: Who wins the war between States and Corporations? *European View*, 9(2), 249-252. doi:10.1007/s12290-010-0129-z
- Burawoy, M. (2005). For Public Sociology. *American Sociological Review*, 70(1), 4-28. doi:10.1177/000312240507000102
- Burton, D. (2005). Marketing Theory Matters. *British Journal of Management*, 16(1), 5-18. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2005.00432.x
- Candler, G. G. (2014). The Study of Public Administration in India, the Philippines, Canada and Australia: the Universal Struggle Against Epistemic Colonization, and Toward Critical Assimilation. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 48(5), 1073-1092. doi:10.1590/0034-76121716

- Carrieri, A. P., & Correia, G. F. A. (2020). Estudos organizacionais no Brasil: construindo acesso ou replicando exclusão? *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 60(1), 59-63. doi:10.1590/s0034-759020200107
- Carrieri, A. P., Papadopoulos, D., Quaresma Júnior, E. A., & Silva, A. R. L. (2021). The ontology of resistance: Power, tactics and making do in the Vila Rubim market. *Urban Studies*, 58(8), 1615-1633. doi:10.1177/0042098020912193
- Chia, R. (2009). Ontology: Organization as world-making. In R. Westwood, & S. Clegg (Eds.), *Debating Organization: Point-Counterpoint in Organization Studies* (pp. 98-113). Hoboken: Blackwell.
- Clark, T. (2017). Rethinking Chile's 'Chicago Boys': Neoliberal technocrats or revolutionary vanguard? *Third World Quarterly*, 38(6), 1350-1365. doi:10.1080/01436597.2016.1268906
- Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Contu, A. (2019). Answering the crisis with intellectual activism: Making a difference as business schools scholars. *Human Relations*, 73(5), 737-757. doi:10.1177/0018726719827366
- Cornelissen, J., & Höllerer, M. A. (2020). An Open and Inclusive Space for Theorizing: Introducing Organization Theory. *Organization Theory*, 1(1), 263178771988798. doi:10.1177/2631787719887980
- Couto, F. F., & Carrieri, A. P. (2018). Enrique Dussel e a Filosofia da Libertação nos Estudos Organizacionais. *Cadernos EBAPE.BR*, 16(4), 631-641. doi:10.1590/1679-395169213
- Crouch, C. (2011). *The Strange Non-Death of Neoliberalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Dar, S., Liu, H., Martinez Dy, A., & Brewis, D. N. (2020). The business school is racist: Act up! *Organization*, 1350508420928521. doi:10.1177/1350508420928521
- Davila, C. (1991). The Evolution of Management Education and Development in Latin America. *Journal of Management Development*, 10(6), 22-31. doi:10.1108/02621719110143543
- Day, G. S. (2001). *A Empresa Orientada para o Mercado: Compreender, Atrair e Manter Clientes Valiosos*. Porto Alegre, RS: Bookman.
- Deshpandé, R., Farley, J. U., & Webster, F. E. (1993). Corporate Culture, Customer Orientation, and Innovativeness in Japanese Firms: A Quadrant Analysis. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 23-37. doi:10.1177/002224299305700102
- Doh, J. P., Lawton, T. C., & Rajwani, T. (2012). Advancing Nonmarket Strategy Research: Institutional Perspectives in a Changing World. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(3), 22-39. doi:10.5465/amp.2012.0041
- Domingues, J. M. (2009). Global Modernization, 'Coloniality' and a Critical Sociology for Contemporary Latin America. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(1), 112-133. doi:10.1177/0263276408099018
- Duménil, G., & Lévy, D. (2007). Neoliberalismo: neo-imperialismo. *Economia e Sociedade*, 16(1), 1-19. doi:10.1590/S0104-06182007000100001



- Dussel, E. (1993). *1492: O encobrimento do Outro (A origem do “mito da modernidade”)*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- Dussel, E. (2005). *Filosofia da Libertação: Crítica à Ideologia da Exclusão* (3a ed.). São Paulo, SP: Paulus.
- Dussel, E. (2011). From critical theory to the philosophy of liberation: Some themes for dialogue. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(2), 2-28. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3etKjyJ>
- Dussel, E. (2013a). *Ethics of liberation: In the age of globalization and exclusion*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.
- Dussel, E. (2013b). *Para uma política de la Liberación*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Las cuarenta/Gorla.
- Ehrnström-Fuentes, M. (2016). Delinking legitimacies: A pluriversal perspective on political CSR. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(3), 433-462. doi:10.1111/joms.12173
- Eyal, G., Szelényi, I., & Townsley, E. (1997). The Theory of Post-Communist Managerialism. *New Left Review*, 60-92. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3tnyz4N>
- Farazmand, A. (1999). Globalization and Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 59(6), 509. doi:10.2307/3110299
- Faria, A. (2004). Theorising networks from a critical realist standpoint. In S. Fleetwood, & S. Ackroyd (Eds.), *Critical Realist Applications in Organisation and Management Studies* (pp. 211-233). London: Routledge.
- Faria, A. (2011). Repensando Redes Estratégicas. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 15(1), 84-102. doi:10.1590/S1415-65552011000100006
- Faria, A. (2015). Promovendo (De)crescimento em/dos Estudos Organizacionais e de Gestão. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 19(1), 149-159. doi:10.1590/1982-7849rac20158122
- Faria, A., & Abdalla, M. M. (2014). O que é (estratégia de) não mercado? *Organizações & Sociedade*, 21(69), 315-333. doi:10.1590/S1984-92302014000200007
- Faria, A., & Hemais, M. (2020). Transmodernizing Management Historiographies of Consumerism for the Majority. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-19. doi:10.1007/s10551-020-04528-y
- Faria, A., Imasato, T., & Guedes, A. L. M. (2014). O Que Gestão Estratégica Tem a Ver com Capitalismo(s)? *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 18(spe), 2-21. doi:10.1590/1982-7849rac20141177
- Firat, A. F. (2010). Commentaries on the state of journals in marketing. *Marketing Theory*, 10(4), 437-455. doi:10.1177/1470593110382827
- Firat, A. F., & Dholakia, N. (2006). Theoretical and philosophical implications of postmodern debates: some challenges to modern marketing. *Marketing Theory*, 6(2), 123-162. doi:10.1177/1470593106063981
- Fleetwood, S. (2005). Ontology in Organization and Management Studies: A Critical Realist Perspective. *Organization*, 12(2), 197-222. doi:10.1177/1350508405051188

- Fligstein, N. (2002). *The Architecture of Markets: An Economic Sociology of Twenty-First-Century Capitalist Societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fotaki, M., & Prasad, A. (2015). Questioning Neoliberal Capitalism and Economic Inequality in Business Schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14(4), 556-575. doi:10.5465/amle.2014.0182
- Frynas, J. G., Child, J., & Tarba, S. Y. (2017). Non-market Social and Political Strategies – New Integrative Approaches and Interdisciplinary Borrowings. *British Journal of Management*, 28(4), 559-574. doi:10.1111/1467-8551.12253
- Fukuyama, F. (1989). The End of History? *The National Interest*, 16, 3-18. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3eqU7cE>
- Furtado, C. (1959). *Formação Econômica do Brasil*. São Paulo, SP: Companhia das Letras.
- Gill, S. (1995). Globalisation, market civilisation, and disciplinary neoliberalism. *Millennium*, 24(3), 399-423. doi:10.1177/03058298950240030801
- Gills, B. K. (2014). Interview: Barry K. Gills. *Globalizations*, 11(4), 561-572. doi:10.1080/14747731.2014.951230
- Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. Nova Iorque: Continuum.
- Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Giroux, H. A. (2015). *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex*. London: Routledge.
- Glosny, M. A. (2010). China and the BRICs: A Real (but Limited) Partnership in a Unipolar World. *Polity*, 42(1), 100-129. doi:10.1057/pol.2009.14
- Grosfoguel, R. (2008). Para descolonizar os estudos de economia política e os estudos pós-coloniais: Transmodernidade, pensamento de fronteira e colonialidade global. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 80, 115-147. doi:10.4000/rccs.697
- Grosfoguel, R. (2012). Descolonizar as esquerdas ocidentalizadas: para além das esquerdas eurocêntricas rumo a uma esquerda transmoderna descolonial. *Contemporânea*, 2(2), 337-362. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3o3qDET>
- Guerreiro-Ramos, A. (1981). *The New Science of Organizations: A Reconceptualization of the Wealth of Nations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Guevara, E., & Waters, M. A. (2000). *Che Guevara Talks to Young People*. College Park: Pathfinder.
- Harmer, T. (2011). *Allende's Chile and the Inter-American Cold War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Hartwig, M. (Ed.). (2015). *Dictionary of critical realism*. London: Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (2006). Neo-liberalism as creative destruction. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 88(2), 145-158. doi:10.1111/j.0435-3684.2006.00211.x
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2013a). *O Neoliberalismo: história e implicações* (4a ed.). São Paulo, SP: Loyola.

- Harvey, D. (2013b). *O novo imperialismo* (7a ed.). São Paulo, SP: Loyola.
- Henderson, S. (1998). No such thing as market orientation – a call for no more papers. *Management Decision*, 36(9), 598-609. doi:10.1108/00251749810239487
- Higgins, N. P. (2004). *Understanding the Chiapas Rebellion: modernist visions and the invisible Indian*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Hirschmann, D. (1981). Development or underdevelopment administration? A further 'deadlock'. *Development and Change*, 12(3), 459-479. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7660.1981.tb00809.x
- Hong, G. K. (2015). Neoliberalism. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, 1(1), 56. doi:10.5749/jcritethnstud.1.1.0056
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22-49. doi:10.2307/20045621
- Ibarra-Colado, E. (2006). Organization Studies and Epistemic Coloniality in Latin America: Thinking Otherness from the Margins. *Organization*, 13(4), 463-488. doi:10.1177/1350508406065851
- Ibarra-Colado, E. (2011). Introduction: Critical Approaches to Comparative Studies in Organizations: From Current Management Knowledge to Emerging Agendas. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 28(2), 154-159. doi:10.1002/cjas.212
- Joseph, P. E. (2006). *The Black Power Movement*. London: Routledge.
- Kamola, I. (2019). The Long '68: African Anticolonialism and the Emergence of a World University System. *Cultural Politics*, 15(3), 303-314. doi:10.1215/17432197-7725451
- Khurana, R. (2010). *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- King, T., Navarro, J., & Smith, A. (Eds.). (2020). *Otherwise Worlds: Against Settler Colonialism and Anti-Blackness*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kipping, M., Engwall, L., & Üsdiken, B. (2008). Preface: The Transfer of Management Knowledge to Peripheral Countries. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 38(4), 3-16. doi:10.2753/IMO0020-8825380400
- Kotler, P. (1972). What consumerism means for marketers. *Harvard Business Review*, 50(3), 48-57.
- Larrain, J. (1991). *Theories of development: Capitalism, colonialism and dependency*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lawton, T., & Rajwani, T. (Eds.). (2015). *The Routledge companion to non-market strategy*. London: Routledge.
- Levy, D. L., Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2003). Critical Approaches to Strategic Management. In M. Alvesson, & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Studying Management Critically* (pp. 92-110). New York: Sage Publications.
- Lipton, M. (2017). Are the BRICS reformers, revolutionaries, or counter-revolutionaries? *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 24(1), 41-59. doi:10.1080/10220461.2017.1321039

- Lorenz, C. (2012). If you're so smart, why are you under surveillance? Universities, neoliberalism, and new public management. *Critical inquiry*, 38(3), 599-629. doi:10.1086/664553
- Magill, K. (1994). Against critical realism. *Capital & Class*, 18(3), 113-136. doi:10.1177/030981689405400106
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). On The Coloniality of Being. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2-3), 240-270. doi:10.1080/09502380601162548
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2008). *Against War: Views from the Underside of Modernity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mandiola, M., & Varas, A. (2018). "Educar es gobernar" Explorando los inicios del managerialismo masculino en la academia chilena. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, 31(43), 57-78. doi:10.26489/rvs.v31i43.3
- Marable, M. (2015). *How Capitalism Underdeveloped Black America: Problems in Race, Political Economy, and Society*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Márquez, J. D., & Rana, J. (2017). Black Radical Possibility and the Decolonial International. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 116(3), 505-528. doi:10.1215/00382876-3961461
- Martins, C. E. (2011). *Globalização, Dependência e Neoliberalismo na América Latina*. São Paulo, SP: Boitempo.
- Mbembe, A. J. (2016). Decolonizing the university: New directions. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 15(1), 29-45. doi:10.1177/1474022215618513
- Melamed, J. (2006). The Spirit of Neoliberalism: From Racial liberalism to neoliberal multiculturalism. *Social Text*, 24(4 (89)), 1-24. doi:10.1215/01642472-2006-009
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011a). *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011b). Epistemic disobedience and the decolonial option: A manifesto. *Transmodernity*, 1(2), 3-23. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3vObNon>
- Mignolo, W. D. (2012). *Local histories/global designs: coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking (Paperback)*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, W. D., & Walsh, C. E. (2018). *On Decoloniality: Concepts, Analytics, Praxis*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Miller, H. T. (1994). Post-progressive public administration: Lessons from policy networks. *Public Administration Review*, 54(4), 378-386. doi:10.2307/977386
- Mills, C. W. (1956). *The Power Elite*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mir, R., & Watson, A. (2001). Critical realism and constructivism in strategy research: toward a synthesis. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(12), 1169-1173. doi:10.1002/smj.200
- Murphy, J., & Willmott, H. (2015). The Rise of the 1%: An Organizational Explanation. *Elites on Trial*, 43, 25-53. doi:10.1108/S0733-558X20150000043013
- Nkomo, S. M. (1992). The emperor has no clothes: Rewriting "race in organizations". *Academy of*

*Management Review*, 17(3), 487-513. doi:10.2307/258720

Nkomo, S. M. (2015). Challenges for Management and Business Education in a “Developmental” State: The Case of South Africa. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14(2), 242-258. doi:10.5465/amle.2014.0323

Nkomo, S., & Hoobler, J. M. (2014). A historical perspective on diversity ideologies in the United States: Reflections on human resource management research and practice. *Human Resource Management Review*, 24(3), 245-257. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2014.03.006

Nye, J. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.

Oyedemi, T. (2018). (De)coloniality and South African academe. *Critical Studies in Education*, 61(4), 1-17. doi:10.1080/17508487.2018.1481123

Paes de Paula, A. P. (2005). Administração pública brasileira entre o gerencialismo e a gestão social. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 45(1), 36-49. doi:10.1590/S0034-75902005000100005

Paes de Paula, A. P. (2008). Maurício Tragtenberg: contribuições de um marxista anarquizante para os estudos organizacionais críticos. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 42(5), 949-968. doi:10.1590/S0034-76122008000500007

Painter, M., & Peters, B. (2010). *Tradition and Public Administration*. Basingstoke: Springer.

Parker, M., Cheney, G., Fournier, V., & Land, C. (2014). *The Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization*. London: Routledge.

Parmar, I. (2019). Transnational elite knowledge networks: Managing American hegemony in turbulent times. *Security Studies*, 28(3), 532-564. doi:10.1080/09636412.2019.1604986

Peci, A., Pieranti, O. P., & Rodrigues, S. (2008). Governança e new public management: convergências e contradições no contexto brasileiro. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 15(46), 39-55. doi:10.1590/S1984-92302008000300002

Peck, J. (2005). Economic Sociologies in Space. *Economic Geography*, 81(2), 129-175. doi:10.1111/j.1944-8287.2005.tb00263.x

Pieterse, J. N. (2004). *Globalization or empire?* London: Routledge.

Plehwe, D., Walpen, B. J., & Neunhöffer, G. (Eds.). (2007). *Neoliberal Hegemony: A Global Critique*. London: Routledge.

Pollitt, C. (2016). Managerialism Redux? *Financial Accountability & Management*, 32(4), 429-447. doi:10.1111/faam.12094

Prasad, A., Prasad, P., Mills, A. J., & Mills, J. H. (Eds.). (2015). *The Routledge Companion to Critical Management Studies*. London: Routledge.

Puppim de Oliveira, J. A., Jing, Y., & Collins, P. (2015). Public administration for development: trends and the way forward. *Public Administration and Development*, 35, 65-72. doi:10.1002/pad.1716

Quelha de Sá, R. G., & Costa, A. S. M. (2019). In search of transparency: ANTi-History, memorials and resistance. *Journal of Management History*, 25(4), 493-515. doi:10.1108/JMH-02-2018-

0012

- Rajagopal, A. (2004). America and its others. *Interventions*, 6(3), 317-329. doi:10.1080/1369801042000280998
- Reed, M. (2005). Reflections on the "Realist Turn" in Organization and Management Studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(8), 1621-1644. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00559.x
- Reiter, B. (Ed.). (2018). *Constructing the pluriverse: the geopolitics of knowledge*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Rhodes, C., Wright, C., & Pullen, A. (2018). Changing the world? The politics of activism and impact in the neoliberal university. *Organization*, 25(1), 139-147. doi:10.1177/1350508417726546
- Richards, P. (2010). Of Indians and terrorists: how the state and local elites construct the Mapuche in neoliberal multicultural Chile. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 42(1), 59-90. doi:10.1017/S0022216X10000052
- Rickford, R. (2016). Black Lives Matter. *New Labor Forum*, 25(1), 34-42. doi:10.1177/1095796015620171
- Robinson, C. J. (2000). *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Rodríguez, D. (2011). Multiculturalist White Supremacy and the Substructure of the Body. In M. J. Casper, & P. Murrah (Eds.), *Corpus* (pp. 39-60). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rogin, M. (1990). "Make My Day!": Spectacle as Amnesia in Imperial Politics. *Representations*, 29, 99-123. doi:10.2307/2928420
- Santos, B. S. (2018). *The end of the cognitive empire: The coming of age of epistemologies of the South*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Santos, B. S., & Meneses, M. P. (2014). *Epistemologias do Sul*. São Paulo, SP: Cortez.
- Santos, T. (1970). The Structure of Dependence. *The American Economic Review*, 60(2), 231-236. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2QTeMxd>
- Silva, A. O., & Abdalla, M. M. (2020). Desenvolvimento? Para Quem? Relações Estratégicas entre Empresa e Sociedade: o lado obscuro da privatização da Companhia Siderúrgica Nacional (CSN). *Revista Eletrônica de Administração*, 26(1), 49-80. doi:10.1590/1413-2311.276.95590
- Sklair, L. (1997). Social Movements for Global Capitalism: The Transnational Capitalist Class in Action. *Review of International Political Economy*, 4(3), 514-538. doi:10.1080/096922997347733
- Sklair, L. (2011). The transition from capitalist globalization to socialist globalization. *Journal of Democratic Socialism*, 1(1), 1-14. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3usnykg>
- Soss, J., Fording, R., Schram, S., & Schram, S. (2011). *Disciplining the poor: Neoliberal paternalism and the persistent power of race*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Souza, C. (2001). Participatory budgeting in Brazilian cities: limits and possibilities in building democratic institutions. *Environment and Urbanization*, 13(1), 159-184. doi:10.1177/095624780101300112

- Statler, K. (2007). *Replacing France: The Origins of American Intervention in Vietnam*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Steger, M. B., & Roy, R. K. (2010). *Neoliberalism: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stivers, C. (2007). "So poor and so black": hurricane Katrina, public administration, and the issue of race. *Public Administration Review*, 67, 48-56. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00812.x
- Tadajewski, M., & Saren, M. (2008). The past is a foreign country: amnesia and marketing theory. *Marketing Theory*, 8(4), 323-338. doi:10.1177/1470593108096539
- Tavares, M., & Gomes, S. (2020). *Epistemologias Contra-Hegemônicas: Desafios para a Educação Superior*. Curitiba, PR: Appris.
- Terry, L. D. (1998). Administrative Leadership, Neo-Managerialism, and the Public Management Movement. *Public Administration Review*, 58(3), 194-200. doi:10.2307/976559
- van Elteren, M. (2003). U.S. Cultural Imperialism: Today Only a Chimera. *SAIS Review*, 23(2), 169-188. doi:10.1353/sais.2003.0038
- Vieira, F. G. D. (2003). *A soberania do consumidor como um mito perante situações de redução de embalagens no mercado brasileiro*. Artigo apresentado no 27o Encontro da Associação Nacional dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Administração, Atibaia, SP.
- Wade, R. (2010). After the Crisis: Industrial Policy and the Developmental State in Low-Income Countries. *Global Policy*, 1(2), 150-161. doi: 10.1111/j.1758-5899.2010.00036.x
- Wallerstein, I. (2009). Reading Fanon in the 21st century. *New Left Review*, 57, 117-125.
- Walsh, J. P. (2015). Organization and management scholarship in and for Africa... and the world. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 29(1), 1-6. doi:10.5465/amp.2015.0019
- White, S. (2002). Thinking race, thinking development. *Third World Quarterly*, 23(3), 407-419. doi:10.1080/01436590220138358
- Whittington, R. (1992). Putting Giddens Into Action: Social Systems and Managerial Agency. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29(6), 693-712. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.1992.tb00685.x
- Young, R. J. C. (2001). Postcolonialism: An historical introduction. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, 1(1), 56-67.
- Zhang, L., & Ong, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Privatizing China: socialism from afar*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

## Funding

The authors did not receive any financial support for the research, authorship, or publication of this article.

## Authorship

### Alexandre Faria

Alexandre Faria is Associate Professor at Fundação Getúlio Vargas / Brazilian School of Public and Business Administration, Rio de Janeiro - RJ, Brazil. PhD in Industrial and Business Studies at Warwick Business School, United Kingdom.

E-mail: alex.faria@fgv.br

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9095-725X>

### Márcio Moutinho Abdalla

Márcio Moutinho Abdalla is professor in the Postgraduate Program in Business Administration - Professional Master in Business Administration at Universidade Federal Fluminense, Volta Redonda - RJ, Brazil. PhD in Administration by Fundação Getúlio Vargas.

E-mail: marcioabdalla@id.uff.br

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2607-1021>

### Ana Lucia Guedes

Ana Lucia Guedes is Academic Coordinator / Researcher of the Public Policy Analysis Directorate (DAPP) of Fundação Getúlio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro - RJ, Brazil. Ph.D. in International Relations by London School of Economics and Political Science - LSE.

E-mail: ana.guedes@fgv.br

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9261-7811>

## Conflicts of interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests.

## Authors' contributions

**First author:** conception (leader), investigation (equal), supervision (leader), writing – original draft (equal), writing – reviewing and editing (equal).

**Second author:** conception (support), investigation (equal), supervision (support), writing – original draft (equal), writing – reviewing and editing (equal).

**Third author:** conception (support), investigation (equal), supervision (support), writing – original draft (equal), writing – reviewing and editing (equal).



## Plagiarism check

The O&S carries out a plagiarism analysis of all documents approved for publication, using a specific tool.

## Data availability

The O&S encourages the sharing of data. However, to respect ethical principles, it does not require the disclosure of any means of identifying the research participants, thus fully preserving their privacy. The open data practice seeks to ensure transparency of the research results, without revealing the identity of the research participants.

*O&S is a signatory of DORA (The Declaration on Research Assessment) and of COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics).*



*Creative Commons Atribuição 4.0 Internacional*