



08, 09, 10 e 11 de novembro de 2022
ISSN 2177-3866

Towards a typology of organizing for a post-development paradigm

BÁRBARA EDUARDA NÓBREGA BASTOS

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE PERNAMBUCO (UFPE)

LUCAS CASAGRANDE

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL (UFRGS)

TIAGO FRANCA BARRETO

UNIVERSIDADE DE PERNAMBUCO (UPE)

Towards a typology of organizing for a post-development paradigm

Abstract

Development has become one of the main social paradigms of modern times. It is more than just a socio-economic goal, because it shapes the worldview and how societies are constituted and organized. This article presents the post-development critique of the development paradigm and analyzes the potentiality of the post-development perspective to rethink organizing. Post-development rejects the imperative of economic growth, seeking to liberate economic thinking and provoke reflection on alternatives, based on fundamental principles, such as: local scale, autonomy and vernacular and cultural diversity. The question that guides this essay is: What typology may we adopt in order to create a conceptual basis to post-development research? Since the transition to the post-development paradigm allows us to break with the idea that there is only one best way to organize social practices, and recognize vernacular possibilities. In the post-development paradigm, varied experiences of production in terms of productivity, technology and scale are recognized and accepted as legitimate modes and not inferior to the 'modern' ones. By considering economics as a means, not an end, and rejecting economic rationality, environmental and social values are prioritized in relation to capital accumulation.

Keywords

Post-development, Degrowth, Organizing.

Introduction

The common belief that there is no alternative to market managerialism (Parker et al., 2007) is ubiquitous in organizational studies' theoretical tradition. This renders alternative organizational experiences unseen and disregards historical and organizations' social contexts (Misoczky & Vecchio, 2006; Motta, 1990).

Here we aim to de-naturalize the hegemonic model of organization and to unveil organizational experiences that escape from market-centered orientation. According to Clegg (1998), organizational studies have adopted very narrow theoretical perspectives, which led to the failure to represent the complexity of the organizational world outside the scope of the empirical examples studied. Even among the authors of critical organizational studies, most of the work is about business organizations, and aimed at criticizing various dimensions of this model of organization.

The post-development perspective is still very little explored in organizational studies, where criticisms of economic development often point only to sustainable development as a possible alternative path. The post-development paradigm, by breaking with the growth imperative, stimulates thinking about organizing in enriched social relations, in which the economic dimension is not a protagonist, but subordinated to median and long term preoccupations of individuals and communities. Many social experiences already exist following this logic, but are usually disqualified, due to the hegemony of the productivist logic, which only recognizes a productive work when it maximizes the generation of profits (Santos, 2002). Thus, by bringing this issue to organizational studies, it is possible to

contribute to theorizing about organizing, outside the market managerialism model.

The transition to the post-development paradigm implies organizing activities in society based on different parameters, rejecting market managerialism as the only possibility and valuing a practice of organizing more focused on the needs of the individuals involved and less focused on creating organizations to generate profit and thrive in a competitive market.

The question that guides this theoretical essay is: **What typology may we adopt in order to create a conceptual basis to post-development research?** To substantiate this issue, the work was structured in three sections, in addition to the introduction and final thoughts. The first presents the main criticisms of development from the perspective of post-development. Then a historical rescue of the emergence of the predominant model of organizing is made. In the third section we discuss how the perspective of organizing extends the vision of possibilities beyond management. Finally, in the conclusions, we compare how the main characteristics of organizing predominate in development and in post-development paradigms.

1. The problem of development

The development paradigm, which has gained a post-war global projection, links the notion of civilization to an industrialized, predominantly urban, western model of society. Since the II World War, the US arrangement of economy and society has been the main model exported to other countries. To those countries, becoming civilized turned out to be a synonym for abandoning traditional modes of socialization, production, and consumption. Insofar, ‘developed’ became the most desired virtue of any country (Santos, 2014).

The consequences of this collective global endeavor are, by now, clear. On one hand, we have unique environmental devastation in peripheral countries. Mining, oil production, and, mostly, monoculture plantations, took the place of vernacular communities and forests. On the other hand, the promised social improvements look every day further away. Instead, we perceive an increase in income inequality, urban misery, and the destruction of traditional ways of life (Santos and Rodriguez, 2012).

After the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held in Stockholm, the idea of unlimited growth and development was heavily questioned. There was presented the Meadows Report, sponsored by the “Club of Rome” and carried on by a team of M.I.T. researchers. The study showed a clear limit to human exploitation of our planet’s natural resources. In a century or so, they claimed, Earth would reach the threshold where several consequences would be felt worldwide. Industrial capacity, food production, and, by consequence, the population would decline abruptly. To face this, the report suggested the idea of stagnation of growth (Meadows et al, 2018).

Although the Meadows Report was sponsored by many big corporations, these proposals were not widely accepted by the industrial elites worldwide (Freitas et al, 2020). The report was criticized for its pessimism. In particular, the Sussex group labeled the Meadows Report as (neo)Malthusian. According to Freeman (1973), the merits of the question should be what kind of technology is developed and not the growth itself. New technologies, according to this view, could solve the climate and the resource crisis, not requiring slowing down growth or even the devastation of the planet. Freitas et al (2020) call this discourse “extropian optimism”, pointing out the inherent naiveness of this Promethean promise.

But between these two discourses, the idea of ‘sustainable development’ arose as a palatable alternative to zero growth while acknowledging the obvious climate challenge we face. This view tries to balance economic, social, and environmental dimensions (Sachs I, 2007). But being the mainstream position of governments since, at least, United Nations Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, it is nowadays undeniably a

weak proposition for the global economy facing the climate emergency. This discourse faces heavy criticism since the imperative of unlimited growth generates the constant need to expand economic transactions by creating new products or services or by creating more people demanding them (Latouche, 2009).

According to Veiga (2006), the broad use of the term 'sustainable development is a sign of elites' awareness of the problem of natural boundaries. Development should not be pursued at all costs but must be qualified. This leads to the questioning of this need for qualification of development: is it an improvement of the same, or would it be the recognition of the necessity of its negation/overcoming? For the author, it is not a mere insufficiency of the notion of development, but rather the growing exhaustion of one of the main social paradigms of modern times, shared by both many socialists and liberals.

For critics of unlimited growth, it is not possible to reconcile growth with Earth's natural capabilities by switching to more environmentally friendly technologies, since the reduction of the ecological damage achieved by 'green technologies' is more than offset by the growth of the production they generate (Parker et al., 2007).

Facing those three mainstream positions (zero growth; extropian optimism; and sustainable development) there is fourth discourse: the post-development. It rejects the economic growth imperative, understanding it as the modern religion or creed, seeking to provoke reflection on alternatives (Parker et al., 2007). According to these authors, criticism of growth measurements, such as the Gross National Product, is based mainly on taking into account the production of commodities, ignoring the so-called externalities, such as justice, equality, democracy, human and ecosystems health, and social relations (Parker et al., 2007).

Questioning development and, above all, questioning the expectation for further development has been an arduous critique worldwide, as development has settled in the minds and became the 'great universal religion of the second half of the twentieth century'. Discussing with development supporters became almost insurmountable, especially for those who fight for local alternatives (Garcia, 2012).

According to Sachs W (1992: 1), 'development is much more than just a socioeconomic goal; it is a perception that shapes reality, a myth that comforts societies, and a fantasy that unleashes passions.' As Latouche (2014) perceives, the critique of development faces the colonization of the imaginary.

Gorz (2006) finds it paramount to ask ourselves what growth we need, what we lack, and what growth should bring us. The increase in GDP does not guarantee an increase in the availability of products needed by the population, but rather a need for capital, since it generally creates more poverty, as far as it brings income to a minority to the detriment of the majority, while deteriorating the quality of life and environment. The wealth and resources most often lacking by the population, such as healthy food, clean water, and healthy housing, are minor issues in the GDP (Gorz, 2006).

Only what can be sold as a commodity is recognized by GDP, just as the work sold to a company that makes a profit, with the possibility of increasing capital (Gorz, 2006). For instance, water that is polluted and treated produces more GDP, even if it still lacks quality compared to a clean river.

For the author, growth is a necessity of capital, totally independent and indifferent to the material reality of the content of growth, leading to a paradoxical development that consumes increasingly more resources. This leads to the loss of autonomy, to increase the time spent working and creating 'disabling professions' (as in Illich, 1978) or 'bullshit jobs' (as in Graeber, 2018). More work lacks meaning, resulting in a diminishing quality of life.

Another core problem of the development idea is the progressing destruction of cultural abilities, centering the worldwide episteme in industrial production (Illich, 1975). While development destroys vernacular abilities, it creates an unprecedented heteronomy, rendering

people hostages of professional services and concentrating knowledge, capital, and power. Opposing this, the source of alternatives to development lies in the epistemic diversity, vernacular cultures, and local ways (Escobar, 2012).

Several different authors and concepts amount to this perspective. As Freitas et al (2020) point out, this post-development perspective (which they call 'convivial degrowth' as a larger umbrella of concepts and authors) includes Post-extractivism (Gudynas, 2013; Acosta, 2018); buen-vivir (Acosta, 2016; Gudynas, 2011); Economy of Permanence (Kumarappa, 1946); Conviviality (Illich, 1973; 1976); Degrowth (Gorz, 1980; Latouche, 2009); Antiutilitarianism (Cailé, 2001); Gift economy (Mauss, 2008; Graeber, 2011); Ecosocialism (Lowy, 2019); Social Ecology (Öcalan, 2017; Bookchin, 1979); Eco-anarchism (Fotopoulos, 1997; Trainer & Trainer, 1995).

The central critique here is aimed at the awareness of the ecological and social crisis, including authors such as Georgescu-Roegen, Ivan Illich, Jacques Ellul, and Ernst Friedrich Schumacher, and with clear resonance with many of the concerns raised by the anticapitalist movement and which questions consumer society and its imaginary bases: progress, science, and technology (Parker et al., 2007; Latouche, 2012).

The growth ideology is not sustainable since it disregards the regenerative capacity of the biosphere. Moreover, it is not desirable, for at least three reasons: 'it produces an increase of inequalities and injustices, it creates a largely illusory welfare; it does not give rise even to those who benefit most, a friendly society, but an antissociation that suffers from its wealth' (Latouche, 2012: 46).

According to Garcia (2012), the key proposals that permeate all proposals and initiatives of post-development, including degrowth, conviviality, and buen vivir are:

- a) emphasis on the local-regional scale as being more adequate for resistance against development, as much as realizing alternatives;
- b) claim autonomy, from the market and State, based on association or community;
- c) cultural diversity, as a source of knowledge based on experience and adapted to the concrete case, rejects universally applicable models and provides a plurality of spaces for a greater diversity of initiatives and experiments (Garcia, 2012).

Unlike perspectives that criticize purely economic development, such as sustainable development, which seeks to reconcile the economic, social, and environmental dimensions, but still with functional contours to the dominant system, those of the post-development do not consider these problems as a failure to reconcile dimensions, but as a consequence of adopting development as a primary objective.

In the next topic, it will be analyzed how the issue of development is associated with the organizational forms that predominate in society, as far as public policies, resource allocation and even the vision (or lack of) on how different activities can be organized tends to privilege some forms in detriment of others.

2. How development creates its own typology

Once we pointed out the problems development is creating – and why we need to seek alternatives, we should look at how development limits organizing in society to one particular form, based on market managerialism (Parker, 2002a). This particular form took shape alongside the Industrial Revolution, and became largely spread with the rise of market society and the dissemination of the idea of development.

For Polanyi (2000), a great process of social disarticulation accompanied the vast movement in favor of economic progress, since the Industrial Revolution, which in turn initiated a belief

that all human problems could be solved with an unlimited amount of material goods. According to Polanyi (2000), work started to be seen as a resource, in the same way as raw materials and electricity. Gradually there was a change in the motivation of the action of the members of society from a motivation of subsistence to profit motive, turning all transactions into monetary transactions and giving rise to the market economy. For the author, while in the previous economy, buying and selling activities did not affect the social fabric, in the market economy there was a transformation of the natural and human substance into commodities, through the implantation of a new form of production, in which workers lost control over the product and the production process.

The loss of control by workers began with the putting-out system, in which the merchants bought the raw materials and marketed the production of craftsmen and went deep into the factories, where the workers left their homes or workshops and began to use the tools that were no longer their own (Marglin, 1996). According to the author, the change to the factory environment was motivated much more by the possibility of control of the workforce than by a technical superiority, since it allowed the bosses to determine the pace of work, the level of productivity and to guarantee the level of accumulation, in a hierarchical relationship. This change was essential to justify the role of coordinator exercised by the entrepreneur. By combining the separate efforts of their workers, the entrepreneurs could obtain a merchandising product, which the workers alone could no longer afford to obtain independently.

The division of labour was the only way for the capitalist to make his role indispensable, not because he was the only one capable of combining the work of the workers, but because he had led them to the inability to perform the function he required for them (Marglin, 1996). As technologies and working methods allowed for greater cost reduction, artisanal producers became unable to compete with the industrial mode of production, which increasingly covered a larger share of the items consumed by society in general.

According to Gorz (2007), it is by paid work (usually salaried) that individuals acquire a social identity and are inserted into a network of relationships and exchanges, being equated with others and granted certain rights in exchange for certain duties. For the author, even for those who are not employed, socially remunerated and determined work is the most important factor of socialization, which makes industrial society distinguish itself from all that preceded it, because it perceives itself as a 'society of workers'. Social work replaced subsistence work with wage labour, leading to a condition in which 'the worker produces nothing that he himself consumes, and consumes nothing of what he produces' (Gorz, 2007:30).

For Illich (1976:9), the loss of autonomy is one of the main problems of industrial society, in which 'the monopoly of the industrial mode of production transforms men into the raw material for the tool', so that instead of men controlling the tool, it controls the man himself. For the author, formal education, medicine and administration complement each other in the manipulation of man to overcome his resistance against the industrial dynamics:

Education produces competitive consumers, medicine keeps us alive in the instrumented environment that has become indispensable to

them, and the bureaucracy reflects the need for the social body to exercise control over individuals devoted to foolish work (Illich, 1976, p63).

Illich (1976) uses the term 'tool' in the broadest possible sense, covering all the rational instruments of human action, as an instrument or as a means to perform a specific task, to be put at the service of an intentionality. Included in this category are items such as brooms and screwdrivers, such as the car, television, factories, institutions that generate goods or services, schools, medical institutions and the media. According to the author, the field open to the concept of tools varies between different cultures, depending on the image that each society imposes on its structure and its environment.

The tool, inherent in social action, can both be dominated by man (convivial) and allow it to impress meaning on the world, as to dominate man (industrial), when its structure conforms and informs its representation of itself (Illich, 1976). For the author, there are a number of reasons why industrial tools cease to serve those who operate them: the destruction of the natural environment, which threatens the right to live in its environment, the threat to autonomy, creativity, the right to speak and the right to tradition. These five threats, according to the author, are interrelated and governed by a total reversal of means at ends, which results from the process of industrial development.

The threat to autonomy rests on a radical monopoly on the super efficiency of tools, which alter the relationship between what people do on their own and what they get out of the industry (Illich, 1976). According to the author, this type of monopoly is different from that of a firm that has exclusive control of the production of a particular good or service, because it not only restricts the choice to a manufacturer, but requires the consumption of an item. If, for example, there is only one brand of soft drink in one locality, people can quench their thirst with other beverages, there would only be a radical monopoly if only one type of product could be able to quench thirst, that is, if the industrial production process excluded the possibility of meeting a need through non-industrial activities.

According to Illich (1976), people have the innate ability to care, comfort, move, acquire knowledge, build their homes and bury their dead. Each of these needs can at first be met without being considered a work with a value of exchange, that is, without resorting to trade. Radical monopoly arises when the social environment is transformed in such a way that a 'better' solution, produced by a tool, causes people to abandon their innate ability to do what they can for themselves and for others (Illich, 1976). According to the author, this replaces the personal response with a standardized object; new forms of scarcity are created, a new level of consumption is established, access to resources is limited and people lose their independence.

The historical movement of the West, under the banner of evolution/ progress/ growth/ development, discovered and then prescribed needs (Illich, 1992). In this process, according to the author, we can observe a transition of the human being to become addicted to needs, which in turn are imputed to him by third parties:

Development can be viewed as a process by which people are deprived of the traditional and cultural common resources. In this

transition, cultural ties are dissolved, even if culture can continue to bring development in a superficial way - it is enough to observe people from the countryside recently transplanted to the megalopolises of the third world. Development can be imagined as a gust of wind that takes people's ground out of their family space and puts them on an artificial platform, a new structure of life. To survive on this new basis, people are compelled to acquire new minimum levels of consumption, for example, in formal education, transportation, and rental housing. The general process is usually formulated in the language of engineering - the creation of infrastructures, the construction and coordination of systems, stages of growth, social escalation. Even rural development is discussed in this urban language (Illich, 1992:96).

Development, from this perspective, functions as a process that standardizes people's way of life, reducing them to a mere profile of needs, defined by professionals, rather than personal demands of freedom, which could provide autonomy (Illich, 1992) . In this process, the industrial tools take the space of convivial tools, and the organization is guided by market principles, to provide industrial solutions, in the form of goods and services, to meet practically all the needs of individuals. Gorz (2007) calls industrialism the selective and particular rationalization behind this worldview, which favors the use of industrial tools and places the economic dimension of social relations above the others, and will be explored in the next topic.

Rationalism and bureaucracy

At the same time that work acquired a central place in people's life, the rationalism inherent to the organization of work gained space beyond the dimension of work. Although, according to Gorz (2007), life in society could be rationalized according to completely different perspectives and directions, from the advent of modernity arose a 'one-dimensional narrowness, indifferent to any other consideration than accounting, by which entrepreneur leads economic rationality to its ultimate consequences'. Rationalization based on a rigorous calculation is one of the fundamental characteristics of individual capitalist enterprise, cautious and circumspectly oriented to the expected result (Gorz, 2007: 27).

From Max Weber's reading, Souza (2011:7) defines rationalism as the 'culturally singular form, as a specific civilization, and by extension also the individuals who constitute their way of thinking and acting from these cultural models, interpret the world.' Thus, there is no universal definition of what is rational, for the way in which rationality is defined depends on the civilizational matrix to which each society belongs.

For Weber, modern Western civilization dominates the rationalism of world domination, which is defined by an instrumental attitude of the human being, who sees the elements around him as mere means for the attainment of ends, thus considering the external nature as something to be explored, devoid of intrinsic value (Souza, 2011). According to the author, these ends within the capitalist market are summed up in the pursuit of profit, so Western individuals can only be rational if they calculate and understand the functioning of

the market to better adapt to it.

'In the name of rationality, the nineteenth century witnessed an attempt to impose the philosophy of progress on the whole world which would culminate in the homogenization of the image of this same world' (Clegg 1998: 35). For the author, in the current theory of organization there are currents that share 'cultural pessimism', without assuming this presupposition, and try to annihilate (in analytical terms) all possibilities of variation between contemporary organizational forms in the name of efficiency and effectiveness. Bureaucracy is an organizational solution that tries to avoid arbitrariness, confrontation between individuals and groups and abuses of power. Its objective is the coordination of human activity to achieve common objectives within a long-term perspective (Motta and Vasconcelos, 2006).

Bureaucratic organization is at the same time a strategy of management and domination and has as its main function the reproduction of the set of social relations determined by the dominant economic system (Motta and Bresser-Pereira, 1991). According to the authors, it constitutes a historical category inserted in the history of the modes of production, with their material conditions of production, instruments of production and forms of cooperation.

For Parker (2002a), it is very difficult to imagine, even the most ordinary activities of our lives, to occur without some management process taking place behind the scenes. Management and managerial practices constitute the characteristic power of our society (Gaulejac, 2007). Given this state of affairs, it is not surprising that many people believe that management is a precondition for an organized society, for social progress and economic growth. Increasingly, it is articulated as the universal solution to any problem that presents itself, as something that protects us from chaos and inefficiency, ensuring that organizations, people and machines do what they claim to do (Parker, 2002a).

Management is considered an obvious response to control nature and ourselves to consolidate order and efficiency. What is at the heart of these modernization accounts is that progress is defined as the process of overcoming disorder, that chaos and disorganization are obstacles, which need to be overcome. Organizing, by conferring order, producing a pattern that will transcend space and persist in the future, allows control of individual and collective destinies (Parker, 2002a). This conception of management has become the dominant ideology of our time, which channels energies and thoughts about a social order submitted to economic interests (Gaulejac, 2007). In no previous society, business occupied the central logic of community life. Only in today's modern societies does the market play the central role, shaping the minds of citizens (Vieira and Silva, 2011).

There is a convergence between Parker (2002a) and Gaulejac (2007) in pointing out the ideological character of management. One of the hegemonic ideas of the early 21st century is managerialism. However, its common sense nature should not be taken to indicate its truth, but only that it reflects the interests of a dominant class of managers (Parker, 2002a). In Parker (2002a), managerialism or market management as the general ideology of management, or in Gaulejac (2007) managerial technologies or managerial power, have had a significant evolution in large private and public organizations since 1980. This imperialism of management found a private home in large organizations, in corporations. But not all

large organizations are managerialists, nor necessarily all organizations are. The instrumentalization of management expertise has found room in most organizations, large and small, as well as in private life.

For Gaulejac (2007), management presents itself as pragmatic, non-ideological, founded on the effectiveness of action. The uncritical celebration of management over the past fifty years has helped to damage democracy, legitimize inequality, and export injustice in the name of a neutral and efficient technology to organize (Parker, 2002a). Behind the apparent neutrality, managerial power positions itself between capital and labour, producing regulations, serving as an instrument at the service of capital and as a system of power organization (Gaulejac, 2007).

The problem is that the idea of market managerialism as the one best way, combined with the ideology of the end of history, has restricted our imagination of what organizing can involve to a remarkable degree. It's almost as if we now have so much faith in management that we cannot imagine getting organized without it. (Parker, 2002a). This managerial power goes beyond the limits of organizations and affects our entire society.

Society as a whole is ordered to mobilize at the service of the economy. Today everything is managed: the goods, the life, the emotions, the intelligence, the family, the health, the education, the city. The management model serves as a reference for a world that must always be more productive and profitable. Each one becomes the entrepreneur of his own life ... All aspects of human existence are apprehended in the management record. From childhood to retirement, self-management becomes a necessity to integrate (Gaulejac, 2007: 311).

However Parker (2002a) indicates that we can see the beginning of a cultural change in the image of management, from savior to problem, and that this is a significant historical movement. The author argues that the particular version of managerialism that has been constructed in the last century is deeply implicated in a wide variety of political and ethical problems, and that it limits our ability to imagine alternative ways of organizing (Parker, 2002a).

3. For a new organizational typology

From the origins of this hegemony of the one best way of organizing, there is a peculiar way of thinking society that guides the configurations of institutions. For Gorz (2007), most of the problems we are experiencing today stem from the crisis of the industrialist utopia:

It is the utopia that has nurtured industrial societies for the last two centuries. [...] When a utopia collapses, it is all the circulation of values that regulate the social dynamics and the meaning of its practices that goes into crisis. This is the crisis we are experiencing. We promised, the industrialist utopia, that the development of productive forces and the expansion of the economic sphere would

liberate humanity from poverty, injustice and malaise; which would give it, with the sovereign power to dominate nature, the sovereign power to determine itself; which would make the work of demiurgic activity and at the same time autopoietic, in which the incomparably unique perfection of each would be recognized - right and duty at one and the same time - as part of the emancipation of all (Gorz, 2007: 20).

This crisis is due to the instrumental rationalization of life. As we shown, the development ideology colonizes thought and, case in point, organizational theory and organizations, creating what is called management.

It is not that alternative organizing does not exist. It does. But we teach and are taught that this is an outlier, an exception or even an error. These teachings are behind most things in Business Schools, making us believe that any alternative possibility is undesirable, impossible or even bad (Parker, 2018).

For Santos (2002), this rationality that produces the non-existence of social experiences alternative to the hegemonic ones is called indolent rationality and it operates by shrinking the present and expanding the future. The subtraction of a part of social reality is a waste of experience, since it prevents other forms of organization of social life from being considered alternatives to hegemonic experiences. The expansion of the future understands it as a linear, automatic and infinite overcoming of the present.

According to Santos (2002), these other forms are rendered non-existent because they are seen as mere obstacles to the organizations that count as important. There are several logics and processes through which metonymic rationality produces the non-existence of what does not fit in its totality and its linear time, united by the characteristic of all being manifestations of the same rational monoculture. Metonymic rationality operates through five monocultures: knowledge, linear time, the naturalization of social differences, the dominant scale, and capitalist productivism. The shrinking of the present produces non-existence considering all that goes against this thought in five main ways: as ignorant, residual, inferior, local, and unproductive (Santos, 2002).

To counter this reality, Santos (2002) defends the mechanisms of Sociology of Absences and Sociology of Emergencies. The first seeks to give visibility to the various existent social experiences that indolent rationality seeks to erase, while the latter explores the potentialities not explored in present social experiences, but which may come to be in the future. The Sociology of Absences and Emergencies, together with the work of translation, creates the Cosmopolitan Reason. This work implies creating reciprocal intelligibility between the experiences of the world, both available and possible, revealed by the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergencies.

‘Ecologies’ represent the mechanisms that cosmopolitan rationality operates to expand the present and shrink the future. The idea of subverting the dominant rationality is therefore to question this production of absences, transforming them into present objects, replacing monocultures with ecologies (of knowledge, temporalities, recognition, local and global scales, and productivities), presenting possibilities of other sociabilities (Paes and Dellagnelo, 2012). In the table below these concepts are related:

Mechanisms of metonymical rationality (that shrinks the present)	Social forms of non-existence	Mechanisms of cosmopolitan rationality
Monoculture of knowledge and scientific rigor	Ignorant	Ecology of knowledges
Monoculture of linear time	Residual	Ecology of temporality
Monoculture of the naturalization of differences	Inferior	Ecology of acknowledgment
Monoculture of the dominant scale	Local	Ecology of trans-scales
Monoculture of capitalist productivism	Unproductive	Ecology of productivities

Table 1: Mechanisms of Metonymical Reason and Cosmopolitan Reason
Source: Developed by the authors, based in Santos (2002)

The five different logics of the production of non-existence are part of the same rational monoculture and are at the basis of the Western way of thinking. The development project historically has been based on indolent rationality, especially on the monoculture of capitalist productivism. Within this logic, organizations that are not based on the primacy of efficiency are delegitimized, as opposed to bureaucratic organizations.

Productivity ecology seeks to recover and value alternative production systems, such as popular economic organizations, worker cooperatives, self-managed enterprises, and solidarity economy, which have been concealed or discredited by ‘capitalist productivist orthodoxy’ (Santos, 2002: 253). For the author, this domain of the sociology of absences is perhaps the most controversial, by directly questioning the paradigm of development and unlimited economic growth, as well as the logic of the primacy of accumulation objectives over the distribution objectives that underpin global capitalism.

The other monocultures also collaborate to strengthen the idea of development. The monoculture of linear time is linked to the idea of progress, and that all nations must follow the historical process of the so-called developed countries, and those that have not yet imitated this model are considered outdated. The author contrasts this monoculture with the ecology of temporalities, whose objective is to restore the temporality proper to social practices, freeing them from their residue status and enabling their autonomous development.

Facing this, we bring the typology proposed by Ivan Illich (1976), where the idea of conviviality can be fruitful. By conviviality, Illich understands the opposite of industrial productivity. The convivial relationship, rather than a conditioned reflex, as it is in the industrial relation, is an action of people who participate in the creation of social life.

But here it is crucial the idea of the tool. We can understand the being as long as it is in relation to tools. In other words, there is an ontology of tools. Capitalism is based on the idea of animated tools (or, as it appears in Illich's books, ‘power tools’ or ‘manipulative tools’). A power tool is described as a technology where the energy required for its operation comes not from the user, but elsewhere. It can be electricity, oil, coal, or another human being or animal (Illich, 1976).

By contrast, there is a second kind of tool, which is the hand tool. This one requires the energy of the user. Modernity produced a society where all hand tools are replaced (or desired to be replaced) by power tools. And while that can be useful until a certain point (or threshold), it instrumentalizes all of its users after this threshold, since everyone becomes a tool of someone else.

For Illich, a convivial society is based on the collective use of hand tools as prevailing over power tools. This is not to say we should transport goods with bicycles, but definitely means we should put into question the widespread usage of cars -- as one-ton battering rams powered by fuel explosions -- for individual mobility.

The prevalence of hand tools also impacts how the ontology of labor shifts from heterogeneity to vernacular autonomy. The shift from the industrial society to conviviality replaces a technical value with an ethical value. 'Conviviality is individual freedom, realized within the process of production, within a society equipped with effective tools' (Illich, 1976: 25). For the author, when coexistence is reduced below a certain level, no increase in productivity can effectively satisfy the needs artificially created for individuals.

Some points can be highlighted to synthesize how organizing and the pursuit of development interact. The dominant rationality, which prioritizes the power tools, while producing the non-existence of other forms of sociability, guides the way social life is organized, generating increasingly efficient organizations under strictly economic criteria. This greater 'efficiency' has historically been sought with an expansion of the division of labor, increasing the scale of production and distribution, and the use of industrial solutions for consumption demands. By turning to the market, organizations have become increasingly standardized, exchanging vernacular or spontaneous forms for those that make them more capable of surviving in a competitive environment.

Final thoughts

The post-development perspective expands the possibilities of organizing, since it acknowledges a cosmopolitan rationality (Santos, 2002). It considers economics as a means, not an end, rejecting economic rationality (Gorz, 2007). Environmental and social values are prioritized in relation to capital accumulation. Escaping the tyranny of growth leads to the reinvention of organizing from the needs of each community.

In the table below, the main issues that guide organizing are compared in the paradigms of development and post-development, from the issues raised by Parker, Fournier and Reedy (2007).

Questions	Development	Post-Development
What is organization for?	Accumulate capital and contribute to economic growth	To attend the needs of its members and community where they participate
What should its size be?	The bigger, the more competitive	Scope of local activity
How should activities be coordinated and controlled, and by whom?	Hetero-management – a class of managers control a class of subordinates	Self-management - those who realize activities take part in their own organization
How should ownership be distributed?	Private property	Collective property
How should work be divided?	Division of work in simple tasks to increase productivity/ hierarchy	Unspecialized works/ Artisanal work to serve own needs and of local

		community
How should work be rewarded?	Profit distribution for the owners and salaries to the employees	More egalitarian distribution of income, according to collectively created rules

Table 2 – Organizing in the development and post-development paradigms

By valuing the autonomy of individuals, organizing in the post-development paradigm is a tool to meet the objectives of members of communities, as opposed to meeting the goal of private companies, to generate profits for their owners. The local scale generates enriched social relations and provides greater autonomy for individuals and communities, building a convivial society (Illich, 1976). Organizing, in a convivial society, produces organizations as convivial tools (Illich, 1976), as opposed to organizations as industrial tools.

By organizing themselves according to their needs and interests, individuals no longer need to promote constant growth, a goal that is present in virtually all companies, especially large companies or those operating in highly competitive markets. The need to grow may exist, but not infinitely, but rather to meet local demand.

While in the development paradigm, market managerialism that demands hierarchies, the separation of conception and execution, and the creation of organizations that combine these characteristics to dominate a particular form of market dominates (Parker, 2002a), the non-managerial organization can explore more egalitarian, self-managed, and more focused on the collective construction of responses to the interests of the individuals themselves who have gathered around shared or interrelated needs. Thus, individuals are able to use their workforce as they choose, breaking with the imperative need for wage labour and market consumption to provide for subsistence.

The greater autonomy of the means of production implies a greater freedom of organization, since this process can happen freely between individuals, who interact and decide on the most convenient ways to solve how to provide for their needs and make decisions on how should be the work that they perform in constituted organizations. By eliminating the obligation to produce for the market, other forms of exchange, not necessarily currency-mediated, also become possible, reducing dependence on external factors to provide livelihoods and enabling the establishment of solidary relationships between people and communities.

The transition to a post-development paradigm, therefore, allows us to break with the idea that there is only one ideal way of organizing social practices, and to restore to individuals the possibility of choosing autonomously as they organize themselves to solve their needs, determined intrinsically, not by specialists. Organizing is demanded to satisfy basic needs, and less focused on the accumulation of wealth. Thus, multiple possibilities are opened to organizing, rooted in different geographical and cultural contexts, based on traditions or innovations, according to the choices of each individual or community.

In this essay, we tried to offer both critique and conceptual alternatives to hegemonic ways of organizing. The greater autonomy of the means of production implies greater freedom of organization. By eliminating the obligation to produce for the market, other forms of exchange, not necessarily currency-mediated, also become possible, reducing dependence on external factors to provide livelihoods and enabling the establishment of solidarity relationships between people and communities.

The transition to a post-development paradigm, therefore, allows us to break with the idea

that there is only one ideal way of organizing social practices, and to restore to individuals the possibility of choosing autonomously as they organize themselves to solve their needs, determined intrinsically, not by specialists. Organizing is demanded to satisfy basic needs and is less focused on the accumulation of wealth. Thus, multiple possibilities are opened to organizing, rooted in different geographical and cultural contexts, based on traditions or innovations, according to the choices of each community.

References

- Acosta, A. (2016) *O Bem Viver: uma oportunidade para imaginar outros mundos*. São Paulo: Elefante.
- Acosta, A., & Brand, U. (2018). *Pós-extrativismo e Decrescimento: saídas do labirinto capitalista*. São Paulo: Elefante.
- Bookchin, M. (1979). *Ecology and revolutionary thought*. Anarchos.
- Caillé, A. (2001). O princípio de razão, o utilitarismo e o antiutilitarismo. *Sociedade e Estado*, 16, 26-56.
- Carvalho, C.A.P. (2009) *Políticas culturais e dinâmicas dos territórios locais numa cartografia do campo cultural no Rio Grande do Sul*. Projeto CNPq.
- Clegg, S.R. (1998) *As organizações modernas*. Oeiras, Pt: Celta Ed.
- Cooper, R., & Burrell, G. (2007) *Modernismo, pós-modernismo e análise organizacional: uma introdução*. In: CALDAS MP and BERTERO CO (eds.). *Teoria das organizações*. São Paulo: Atlas.
- Daly, H. *Crescimento sustentável? Não, obrigado*. *Ambiente & Sociedade*, v.7, n. 2, 2004.
- Escobar, A. (2012) *Encountering development: the making and unmaking of the third world*. 2. ed. Princeton university press.
- Freitas, N. C., Casagrande, L., & Meira, F. B. (2020). O que o Antropoceno tem a Aprender com o Decrescimento Convivial? *O Campo Ambiental diante dos Imperativos da Modernidade*. *Revista Gestão & Conexões*, 9(3), 52-73.
- Fotopoulos, T. (Ed.). (1997). *Towards an inclusive democracy: The crisis of the growth economy and the need for a new liberatory project*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Trainer, T., & Trainer, F. E. (1995). *The conserver society: alternatives for sustainability*. Londres. Zed Books.
- Freeman, C. (1973). 1. Malthus with a computer. *Futures*, 5(1), 5-13. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-3287\(73\)90053-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-3287(73)90053-0)
- Garcia, E. (2012) *Decrescimento e bem viver: algumas linhas para um debate adequado*. In: LÉNA P and NASCIMENTO EP (eds.). *Enfrentando os limites do crescimento: sustentabilidade, decrescimento e prosperidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond.
- Gaulejac, V. (2007) *Gestão como doença social: ideologia, poder gerencialista e fragmentação social*. 3. ed. Aparecida: Idéias & Letras.
- Gorz, A. (1980). *Ecology as Politics*. Boston: South End Press.
- Gorz, A. (2004) *Misérias do presente, riqueza do possível*. São Paulo: Annablume.
- Gorz, A. (2006) *A crise e o êxodo da sociedade salarial*. In: SILVA JP and RODRIGUES IJ (eds.). *André Gorz e seus críticos*. São Paulo: Annablume.
- Gorz, A. (2007) *Metamorfoses do trabalho: crítica da razão econômica*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Annablume.
- Gudynas, E. (2011). *Buen vivir: Germinando alternativas al desarrollo*. *América Latina em movimiento*, 462, 1-20.

- Gudynas, E. (2013). Transitions to post-extractivism: directions, options, areas of action. *Beyond Development*, 165.
- Graeber, D. (2011). *Debt: The first five thousand years*. New York: Melville House.
- Graeber, D. (2018). *Bullshit jobs*. E mploi, 131.
- Illich, I. (1973). *Tools for conviviality*. Boston. Marion Boyars.
- Illich, I. (1975). *Medical nemesis* (p. 59). Sydney: Australian Broadcasting Commission, Science Programmes Unit.
- Illich, I. (1976) *A convivencialidade*. Lisboa: Publicações Europa-América.
- Illich, I. (1978). Disabling professions. *India International Centre Quarterly*, 5(1), 23-32.
- Illich, I. (1992) Needs. In: SACHS W (ed.). *The development dictionary: a guide to knowledge as power*. London: Zed books.
- Kumarappa, J. C. (1946). *The economy of permanence*. CP, All India Village Industries.
- Latouche, S. (2003). *À bas le développement durable! Vive la décroissance conviviale!* Objectif décroissance, M. Bernard et al. éds., Paris Parangon, p. 19-26
- Latouche, S. (2009) *Pequeno tratado do decrescimento sereno*. São Paulo: WMF Martins Fontes.
- Latouche, S. (2012) O decrescimento. Por que e como? In: LÉNA P and NASCIMENTO EP (eds.). *Enfrentando os limites do crescimento: sustentabilidade, decrescimento e prosperidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond.
- Latouche, S. (2014). Imaginary, decolonization of (pp. 117-120). In: D'ALISA, Giacomo; DEMARIA, Federico; KALLIS, Giorgos (Ed.). **Degrowth: a vocabulary for a new era**. Routledge, 2014. London: Routledge.
- Löwy, M. (2019). Fontes e Recursos do ecossocialismo. Princípios: Revista de Filosofia (UFRN), 26(51), 405-408.
- Marglin, S. (1996) Origem e funções do parcelamento das tarefas (Para que servem os padrões?). In: GORZ A (ed.). *Crítica da divisão do trabalho*. 3. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., & Behrens, W. W. (2018). The limits to growth. In *Green planet blues* (pp. 25-29). Routledge.
- Motta, F.C.P. FCP (1981) *Burocracia e autogestão: a proposta de Proudhon*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
- Motta, F., & Pereira, L. B. (1991). *Introdução à Organização Burocrática*. 7ª. Edição. São Paulo: Brasiliense. 310p.
- Motta, F.C.P., & Vasconcellos, I.F.G. (2006) *Teoria geral da administração*. 3. ed. São Paulo: Cengage Learning.
- Öcalan, A. (2017). *Manifesto por una civilizacion democratica*, tomo 2, civilizacion capitalista. Barcelona, Espanha. Descontrol Editorial
- Paes de Paula, A.P. (2002). Tragtenberg revisitado: as inexoráveis harmonias administrativas e a burocracia flexível. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 36 (1): 127-144.
- Paes, K.D., & Dellagnelo, E.H.L. (2012). Um diálogo entre Boaventura de Souza Santos e Milton Santos: por um outro olhar a produção do social. In: VII EnEO, Anais... Curitiba: Anpad.
- Parker, M. (2002a) *Against management*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Parker, M. (2002b) *Utopia and the organizational imagination: outopia*. In: PARKER, Martin (ed.). *Utopia and organization*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Parker, M. (2018). *Shut down the business school: What's wrong with management education*. London: Pluto Books.
- Parker, M., Fournier, V., & Reedy, P. (2007) *The dictionary of alternatives: utopianism &*

organization. London: Zed Books.

Polanyi, K. (2000) A grande transformação: as origens de nossa época. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier.

Sachs, I. (2007) Rumo à ecossocioeconomia: teoria e prática do desenvolvimento. São Paulo: Cortez.

Sachs, W. (1992) Introduction. In: SACHS W (ed.). The development dictionary: a guide to knowledge as power. London: Zed books.

Santos, B.S. (2002) Para uma sociologia das ausências e uma sociologia das emergências. Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais, 63: 237-280.

Santos, B.S. (2014) Desenvolvimento ou autodeterminação? Disponível em: <<http://alice.ces.uc.pt/en/index.php/santos-work/desenvolvimento-ou-autodeterminacao/?lang=pt>> Acesso em 12 nov. 2014.

Santos, B.S., & Rodríguez, C. (2012) Introdução: para ampliar o cânone da produção. In: SANTOS BS (ed.). Produzir para viver: os caminhos da produção não capitalista. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.

Souza, J. (2011) O mundo desencantando. In: SOUZA J (ed.). A gênese do capitalismo moderno. São Paulo, Ática.

Veiga, J.E. (2006) A insustentável utopia do desenvolvimento. In: SILVA JP and RODRIGUES IJ (eds.). André Gorz e seus críticos. São Paulo: Annablume.

Vieira, M.M.F., & Silva, R.F.C. (2011) Eight propositions towards new possibilities of studying organizing and organizations. BAR, Curitiba, 8 (4): 454-467.