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**Abstract**

We want to apply border thinking as historical method in management and organization knowledge to bring to the fore the knowledge produced by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) and in particular by Brazilian Celso Furtado. The knowledge produced by them has been taken as “dependence theory” rather than as “dependence studies” and correspondingly suppressed by the enduring forces and mechanisms of geo-epistemic coloniality imposed by the North since colonial times. We aim to show that dependence is a missing link for us to connect management and development from a decolonial perspective from the South.
Introduction

As a result of the many crises faced by western neoliberal capitalism and neoliberal managerialism, the concepts of neocolonialism (Murphy and Zhu, 2012) and Americanization (Van Elteren, 2006) have gained currency within management and organization knowledge (MOK) literature. Historical analyses of processes of Americanization in Europe informed by institutional perspectives (e.g. Engwall, 2004), and of Western colonization in different parts of the rest of the world informed by postcolonial perspectives have got increased attention by the post-Cold War MOK literature (e.g. Alcadipani and Caldas, 2012).

More recently the modernity/coloniality/decoloniality (MCD) research program from Latin America has also been embraced by a few researchers in the analysis of processes of knowledge subalternity and of how the engagement of contemporaneous MOK with this perspective may foster the replacement of Eurocentric universality by pluriversality and alternatives to the western neoliberal order (e.g. Wanderley and Faria, 2012). One of the main assumptions of such historical analyses is that border thinking is a condition for decolonial knowledge and research (see Mignolo and Tlostanova, 2006; Mignolo, 2011).

Interesting enough, the concept of border thinking – as both method and epistemology – remains underdeveloped in spite of its central role for both decolonial historical analyses and decolonial epistemic transformations from the borders of modernity. Border thinking informs how and why some knowers in the past have been capable of fostering decoloniality from the external border of modernity through theorizing, and how and why researchers in the present manage to engage with the corresponding subaltern knowledges and move across the colonial difference to foster micro-processes of pluriversality at both sides of the border. There is a virtual absence of historical analyses within the MOK literature focused on how and why some academics (individuals or groups) have succeeded in moving beyond resistance and transformed border thinking into border theorizing across the colonial/imperial difference within the Cold War period (as an exception see Paula, 2007). This type of historical analysis is of chief importance for the development of border thinking as a both epistemic and transformative method.

MOK literature discusses the historical impact of Americanization in different locations of the world, mainly after World War II (WWII) (Engwall, 2004; Kieser, 2004; Van Elteren, 2006). Critical management literature, mainly via post-development perspective, points out the role of the development apparatus put in motion after WW II and conducted by the global transnational organizations (GTO) – World Bank, International Monetary Fund, United Nations – created in Bretton Woods (Escobar, 1992). According to the later, the discourse imposed from outside by the GTO would supersede local logics of management&development. According to the former, local logics in management would be seriously influenced by the process of Americanization.

From a decolonial perspective (Dussel, 1993; Quijano, 2000; Mignolo, 2011), we partially agree with both, but we believe that instead of bringing to the fore the local networks that struggled in the promotion of management&development, hence instead of being part of the solution, both perspectives – Americanization and post-development – become part of the problem as, when emphasizing the outside-in process, they overlook the processes that in
effect were taking place in the ground. From the locus of enunciation of the South (Mignolo, 2011), what we want to highlight is the inside-out process, then we should ask what kind of management&development knowledge was being boiled in Brazil when US ‘scientific management’ reached our shores? What were the imbrications being formed in the local management&development public-private networks?

In order to achieve our objective in this article we want to apply border thinking as historical method in MOK to bring to the fore the knowledge produced by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) and in particular by Brazilian Celso Furtado. The knowledge produced by them has been taken as “dependence theory” rather than as “dependence studies”, and has been correspondingly suppressed by the enduring forces and mechanisms of geo-epistemic coloniality (Ibarra-Colado, 2006; Mignolo, 2011) imposed by the North (or Occident) since colonial times (Dussel, 1993). By unveiling this knowledge we want to show its chief importance for the constitution of a multipolar world which does not disclaim or keep invisible state-based capitalisms. More specifically we aim to show that dependence is a missing link for us to connect management and development from a decolonial perspective from the South.

This article is divided into five sections including introduction. In the next section we discuss the “Historic turn” in MOK literature and briefly explore its impacts in Brazil. In the third section we introduce the main concepts of the MCD project and we propose border thinking as a method. The fourth section presents the knowledge developed by ECLAC and Furtado within “dependence studies”, which is followed by final considerations.

“Historic turn” in MOK literature and its impacts in Brazil

The decolonial perspective has in itself a proposal to delink from Western epistemology (Mignolo, 2007), and a plea for bringing history and context back into research, namely the history and knowledges of the places that have been negated by European modernity (Mignolo, 2000). The ‘historic turn’ proposal made by Critical Management Studies’ (CMS) authors (Clark and Rowlinson, 2004; Booth and Rowlinson, 2006) is a call against the ahistorical characteristic of MOK and a “turn against the view that organization studies should constitute a science analogous to the physical sciences” (Rowlinson et at, 2009: 289). It proposes a reorientationist agenda (Üsdiken and Kieser, 2004; Rowlinson et al, 2009), through which new historical approaches are suggested in management and organization studies. We understand that, in line with decolonial turn, the reorientationist agenda posits that management practices and discourses are historical, social and geopolitical phenomenon (Booth and Rowlinson, 2006), and that present knowledge should not be naturalized, but considered as the result of practices that could have been different (Jacques, 2006). “Historic turn shifts the emphasis from a preoccupation with what actually happened to a concern with how, if at all, the past can be represented” (Rowlinson et at, 2009: 292). The main concepts that comprise the ‘historic turn’ have been presented in Brazil by Mello et al (2010). “The ‘historic turn’ problematizes universalism and presentism” (Booth and Rowlinson, 2006: 7). ‘Universalism’ represents the view that prevailing management theory is superior to the ones in the past, and that it is applicable to all societies in all times. “Presentism results in research being reported as if it occurred in a decontextualized, extended past” (Booth and Rowlinson, 2006: 6).
We foster our historical critical analysis by engaging in particular with authors from the North, who have problematized the spread of MOK within the US in the Cold War period (Cooke, 1999; Cooke, Mills & Kelley, 2005; Grant and Mills, 2006; Kelley, Mills & Cooke, 2006; Landau, 2006; McLaren and Mills, 2008; McLaren, 2011), and with those who have pointed out that the diffusion of management in Latin America during the Cold War has been overlooked by most analysts (see Alcadipani, 2010; Faria et al., 2010). We agree with historical analyses that have shown that the success of theories and academic careers in management were “in part at least, a consequence of the Cold War” (Cooke et al, 2005: 4), but, given the colonial difference (Mignolo, 2007), we partially agree with the demarcations of the Cold War (Escobar, 2004). By the same token, we believe that the opposite is true, and that many theorists, and much theorizing, have been “written out” (Cooke, 1999) – in particular, subaltern knowledges from Latin America, for instance – by the grand narrative of the Cold War; these need to be decolonized, in order to foster a multipolar and pluriversal space for debates in MOK.

We should mention some critical historiography works that have made use of literature as their basic source of documents. Mills and Helms Hatfield (1998) have investigated US and Canadian management textbooks and concluded that the social context of the Cold War is almost completely absent from them. Cooke (2003) studied the works of Chandler to advocate the denial of slavery in management studies. Grant and Mills (2006) have utilized the texts of the main leaders of the Academy of Management during its formative context (1936-1960) to investigate their role in the development of modern management theory. McLaren and Mills (2008) have researched 17 management textbooks published in the US between 1945 and 1965, in order to explore the effect of the Cold War on the construction of the ‘ideal manager’.

In Brazil, critical historiography is at its infancy, whereas the traditional business history field has never been duly developed. The utilization of historiography in organization studies is still rare (Pieranti, 2008). In spite of the efforts of the few business and management historiographers that have recently created a forum at Anpad’s meetings, there are no research associations, dedicated journals, nor discussion forums in management congresses that would deal exclusively with this theme (Mello, Barros and Martins, 2010). We can mention the works of Alcadipani (2010), Faria et al (2010) and Wanderley and Faria (2012) in initiating a critical investigation on the history of the spread of international management theories to Latin America. Recently Alcadipani and Caldas (2012) have used a postcolonial perspective to investigate the Americanization of MOK in Brazil through the constitution of EAESP. Vizeu (2008) has researched in his dissertation the creation of IDORT, and has later conducted a historiographic research on the rural heritage of the management industrial elites in Brazil and its impact on managerial orientation (Vizeu, 2011).

We would like to contribute to the efforts of Brazilian MOK researches by proposing border thinking as a historical method of investigation.

**Modernity/coloniality/decoloniality project: border thinking as historical method**

The decolonial perspective has been proposed by a group of Latin American scholars as a way to eschew the dominance of European modernity and its corresponding epistemic coloniality (Ibarra-Colado, 2006; Mignolo, 2007), hence giving voice to suppressed knowledges from both North and South. For Mignolo (2000; 2007; 2011) coloniality is the darker and
inseparable side of modernity, and that is negated by the latter. Contrary to the usual demarcation made by European modernity that sets its start in the XVIIth/XVIIIth centuries, decolonial authors suggest that modernity and coloniality have been initiated simultaneously when the Americas were ‘discovered’ by Columbus in 1492 (Dussel, 1993). Since then, a colonial matrix of power (Mignolo, 2011) has been imposed and it lasts much after colonialism political domination is ceased. This domination is composed by coloniality of power (Quijano, 2000), coloniality of being (Mignolo, 2011) and coloniliaty of knowledge (Ibarra-Colado, 2006; Mignolo, 2011).

Since Eurocentric modernity has touched all societies of the world, Mignolo (2000; 2009) posits that we have to move to the borders of the system to be able to create alternatives to modernity. Border thinking is “the epistemology of the exteriority; that is, of the outside created from the inside” (Mignolo and Tlostanova, 2006: 206). These borders have been formed by the encounter of the modern and the colonial that have generated colonial/imperial differences. Thus, critical border thinking gives voice to these colonial differences and pursues the generation of pluriversality, and not universality (Mignolo and Tlostanova, 2006). Hence, the aim is to reach a multipolar world informed by knowledges from both North and South, instead of a unipolar world imposed by Eurocentric modernity.

The mobilization of geopolitics of knowledge through border thinking means shifting the attention to the enunciation, instead of the enunciated, thus making visible the locus of enunciation by asking the questions “who and when, why and where is knowledge generated … it is not enough to change the content of the conversation, it is of the essence to change the terms of the conversation… It means to go to the very assumptions that sustain locus of enunciations” (Mignolo, 2009: 2-4). In our view, the knowledge produced by ECLAC and by Celso Furtado has been generated from such a colonial/imperial difference, and from the ‘outside of the inside’, which is reinforced by the fact that ECLAC was formed by the United Nations and as such had to abide by her rules, which were constructed from another locus of enunciation, the modernization theories of the North. Our general argument is that the reworking of subalternized knowledges and alternatives from emerging economies, illustrated by the broad notion of “dependence studies” from Latin America, is a way to explore border thinking as historical method.

The trajectory of dependency theory (DT) – as it has been branded, classified, and analyzed mainly by the North – is analyzed in this paper as a fine example of a both theoretical and practical contribution from Latin America which has been subalternized in a particular way by the dominant geo-epistemic and geopolitical mechanisms. DT has represented the density of the social knowledge in the region and has moved beyond the mere reproduction of knowledge and methodologies imported from the center (Dos Santos, 2000). Our historical decolonial (re)framing of dependence shows that much of the knowledge that would be later classified as DT had Santiago/Chile as an important nest (Beigel, 2010). There is (still) located ECLAC, which was responsible for the development of the knowledge that became known as structuralism and spread throughout Latin America (Beigel, 2010). From this locus of enunciation, from the ‘outside of the inside’ (Mignolo, 2011), we argue that the main proposals from ECLAC, produced from the colonial difference, implied a different connection of management and development. We also argue that “dependence studies” provide a link from where to reconnect management and development otherwise and foster the replacement of Eurocentric universality by geo-epistemic pluriversality.

We point out that the colonial experience in Latin America did not have to wait “until
the word *postcolonialism* entered the U.S. academy in the early 1980s, after the word *postmodernism* was introduced in France” (Mignolo, 2011: 57). “Dependence” from Latin America antecedes Euro-American post-colonialism/post-development and postcolonial studies and moves beyond “knowledge” produced by formal institutions as ECLAC. It has a broad embeddedness on different understandings of decoloniality even though it was subalternized and classified as “dependency theory” (mainly within the realms of economics) by the geo-epistemic mechanisms of classification of non-Western knowledge which denied its constitution as (decolonial) “dependence studies”. Our historical decolonial analysis of dependence aimed at reworking it as “dependence studies” shows that much of such contribution from Latin America has been subalternized mainly by the successful trajectory of Anglo-American post-colonialism and Marxism within Western “critical social science”, and the absence of a critical perspective from the borders of the South which takes coloniality as an intrinsic condition of modernity (Mignolo, 2000; 2011) and moves beyond DT and formal knowledge.

Postmodernism informed many analyses on dependency theory, grounded on the tradition of post-development studies. Consequently, instead of recognizing the breadth of “dependence”, post-development authors suggest that critiques of development by dependency theorists functioned “within the same discursive space of development, even if seeking to attach it to a different international and class rationality” (Escobar, 1992: 26). Our analysis shows that Westernized framings fail to recognize that “development has always been far more heterogeneous in discourse, policy and practice than implied by the universalizing claims of many anti- and post-development authors” (Simon, 2006: 12). We argue that such Westernized classifications and debates on “dependency theory” represent a process of double subalternization which has concealed not only the decoloniality grounds conveyed by “dependency studies”, but also its geo-political embeddedness.

Given the questions raised by this paper the consequence of our initiative of reframing “dependence studies” is twofold: the engagement of (critical) MOK with “dependence” in Brazil (and beyond), and the pluriversal promotion of border thinking through decoloniality as a historical method of investigation. Both initiatives could counterbalance the current processes of rewesternization by the dark side of Western neoliberal order. In other words, we stand for the reworking of “dependence” as dependence studies in replacement of dependence theory to reconnect management and development “otherwise”.

**“Dependence studies” through border thinking: the knowledge produced by ECLAC and Furtado**

The Westernized notion of “dependency theory” conceals not only the large umbrella conveyed by “dependency studies”, but also its geo-political embeddedness on the notion of decoloniality from Latin America and beyond.

Academics usually differ on how they classify the many streams within dependence studies, but it is arguable that one should not talk about one single current (Beigel, 2010; Bresser-Pereira, 2011; Chirot e Hall, 1982; Grosfoguel, 2002; Kay, 1991; Love, 1990; 2005; Martins, 2011; Palma, 1978; Vernengo, 2006; Wolfe, 1997). It is more usual to divide it into three groups (Bresser-Pereira, 2011): (a) the one considered the most radical, which proposed socialism as the only way out of underdevelopment, whose main authors were Brazilians Theotonio dos Santos, Ruy Mauro Marini and Vania Bambirra, and the German-American André Gunder Frank; (b) the associated dependence, led by Brazilian Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Chilean Enzo Faletto; and (c) the ‘revisionist’ led by Brazilian Celso Furtado.
and Chilean Osvaldo Sunkel. The last two streams proposed a way out of underdevelopment within capitalism and the state as the main driver out of this condition (Love, 2005). The state should act both as a planner and as an entrepreneur to lead the private sector in processes of industrialization and beyond (Bielschowsky, 1987).

A major problem caused by the Westernized labeling of such academic movement, which goes much beyond the academic setting itself as “dependency theory”, is the striking divergence among analysts that followed around who was the progenitor of DT. Some academics recognize Prebisch as the founder (Chirot and Hall, 1982; Sánchez, 2003), while others see Frank (1966) as the most important author and founder of DT (Palma, 1978; Kay, 1991), in spite of his short exposition (1968-73) to the Chilean environment which became the most important nest of DT (Beigel, 2010). As from the military coup in Brazil in 1964, followed by coups in other Latin American countries, to the Chilean one in 1973, all of them sponsored by the state-based imperial capitalist order in opposition to communism in the region, Santiago in Chile became a major refugee for left wing intellectuals.

Contrary to the recognition by some authors, critiques will say that all that Frank generated were “verbatim quotations from a range of sources ... difficult to discern whether he had anything to add” (Wolfe, 1997:394). The fact is that Cardoso and Frank had a long documented dispute in the literature. Cardoso (1977: 8-9), when referring to the contributions made by Frank and other US authors to DT, affirmed that “North American neo-Marxian current did not add to the critical perspective of Latin American thought before 1960”, and he accused Frank of making simplifications to DT that transformed it in a “straw man easy to destroy” (Cardoso, 1977: 15). Frank (1977) considered Cardoso’s position of assuming that the bourgeoisie would lead development as naïve. Cardoso, who would later become president of Brazil (1994-2002), was one of the scholars funded by the Ford Foundation (Parmar, 2002).

A second problem regards the divergences around the genesis of DT: “although structuralism is acknowledge as a progenitor, Marxism is usually viewed, implicitly or explicitly, as the primary tradition from which dependency arose” (Love, 1990: 143). Maybe this is due to the fact that “a dual provenance is conveniently ascribed to dependencia, giving the doctrine a combined North and South American pedigree” (Wolfe, 1997: 393). It has to be noted that only the literature translated to English was read in the North, which is a fraction of what was produced by dependence authors, which may partially explain the difference in interpretations made by scholars and “flawed, prejudiced, or incomplete interpretations of dependency’s ideas” (Sánchez, 2003: 33).

However, irrespective of how many streams it had, and the number of authors involved in the original formulations, and who is considered the founding father, dependence studies have systematically faced epistemic coloniality (Ibarra-Colado, 2006) imposed by the North, from its structuralism origins at ECLAC, up to its reformulation under different Marxist tones. In fact, most of the authors mentioned on the above paragraph, have been forced into a Diaspora following the military coup in Brazil (1964): Cardoso, Dos Santos, Marini and Bambirra went to Chile, where they were later joined by Frank, whereas Furtado went first for one year to the US then to Paris. The September 11th, 1973, military coup in Chile, a regretful date in world history, forced a second exile for all of them: with the exception of Frank, who fled to his home country Germany a few days before the coup, all
other went in different dates to Mexico (Dos Santos, 2000). Cardoso had returned to Brazil in the late 1960’s supported by habeas corpus to reenter the country (Cardoso, 2012).

We have to appreciate the fact that in those times, much before the internet era, such displacements imposed material difficulties for generation and circulation of knowledge. Most of the production of Dos Santos, Marini and Bambirra is only available in Spanish and circulated amongst peers as mimeos in Santiago (Beigel, 2010). Furthermore, the reports of the exiled mention the cruelty and violence of their situation (e.g. Cardoso, 2012). The Brazilians would only gather again in Brazil in the 1980’s when the country opened up to the exiled. But that was too late to find any roots of dependence in the Brazilian academy.

We challenge the authors who argue that the beginning of the Cold War was marked by the re-election of President Truman in the US, in 1948 (Spector, 2006). Border thinking and the colonial experience enables us to point out that in his second term’s inaugural speech, Truman launched the famous Point IV program, which became an important instrument for financing the spread of management knowledge from the US to Third World countries, as a way to block the expansion of communism (Ibarra-Colado, 2006). Point IV stated that “their poverty [underdeveloped areas] is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas” (Truman, 1949: 3). It was the beginning of the imposition of the strategy of ‘develop or I shoot you!’ (Grosfoguel, 2011). From the locus of enunciation of Latin America, we posit that this proposition is similar in content to the one made by scholars from the North when they unilaterally claim for the ‘development turn’, thus ‘repeating the farce’ (Marx, 1852).

Following the Bretton Woods conference, the North would create and control two institutions in order to guarantee the global system order: the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB), the latter remains “one of the key institutions of global managerialism” (Murphy, 2008: 24). The first phase of the World Bank is classified by Murphy (2008: 25) as “naïve globalization”, which may partially explain the relative independence that ECLAC has enjoyed in its first years. It is in this context that ECLAC is created by the United Nations (UN) another global institution created and controlled by the North - under pressure of local countries, with a three year provisional mandate, to propose economic solutions in order to foster the development of the region. Furtado joined within the first months of operation, immediately after finishing PhD in economics at Sorbonne/Paris. From this perspective ECLAC should function as a mere reproducer of the modernization theories from the center. However, this is not what happened and Santiago would later become the locus from where dependence studies, and later “dependency theory”, would emanate (Beigel, 2010).

During the second ECLAC’s conference in Cuba, in 1949, Raúl Prebisch, who by then acted as a consultant, delivered the “Havana Manifesto”. It presented, for the first time, the concept of center-periphery within the global economy, and raised a new proposal of state-led development that opposed the orthodox view. Specialists from both developed and developing countries agreed that “a new debate had been launched” (Dosman, 2011: 285). These ideas coming out of ECLAC were viewed as a threat to the spread of US and European theories and knowledge throughout Latin America. The manifesto challenged the “false sense of universalism existing in the theory used in developed countries” (Prebisch, 1949: 17).

The ideas formulated by ECLAC were mostly welcomed by the developmentalist-states and corresponding alternative capitalisms that were ruling throughout Latin America (Bianchi, 2002). The idea that ECLAC was formulating from the colonial difference, and generating ‘the outside from inside’ may be exemplified by comparing the ‘Havana
Manifesto’ to the actual United Nations (UN) document that would later be produced. UN’s document had a much softer tone than the one presented earlier at Havana, which had the objective of gaining support from government representatives from different countries of Latin America (Bianchi, 2002). In fact, and in accordance with our understanding of “dependence studies” as key element of “decolonial studies” from Latin America (and beyond) the manifesto “consolidated a series of views and policies that were already part of the dominant intellectual milieu in Latin America” (Vernengo, 2006: 556).

ECLAC’s Havana Conference demarcated the launch of a new subaltern knowledge from the South to which Furtado has immediately subscribed. The tenets of this knowledge has anticipated in 30 years the same calls that would later be made by postcolonial theory (PCT), though the latter does not pay homage to the former, nor is PCT geared to recover the principles of the subaltern knowledge developed by ECLAC. From this moment, Latin American countries would count on ECLAC for strategic diagnosis and for the formulation of policies that would eventually be implemented during the 1950’s and early 1960’s (Love, 2005). Accordingly, the program of ‘import substitution industrialization’ (ISI) was implemented by different governments in the region (Bielschowsky, 1987).

We posit that, when those propositions landed in Brazil, they were a match to the “ideological cycle of development” that was taking place geared by an internal process (Bielschowsky, 1987). In fact, it may be argued that an anti-liberal tendency was being built, mainly during the governments of president Vargas (1930-45; 1950-54) of a “believe that the market was not capable of auto-regulation without serious and recurring social and economic crisis, and even less capable of generating advanced industrial development in countries like Brazil” (Bastos, 2006: 272). The anti-liberal logic made visible state-based capitalism and seems to have imposed in Brazil limits to the liberal reforms carried out by president Dutra (1946-50): there seemed to be “a minimum level of government intervention that had to be respected” (Draibe, 1985: 145).

The liberal presidency of Dutra has been followed by two administrations – G. Vargas, 1950-54 and J. Kubitschek (JK), 1956-60 – that were marked by having ECLAC as an important support for policy formulation (Kubitschek, 1955). Upon the creation of Banco Nacional de Desenvolvimento Econômico (BNDE – National Bank of Economic Development; 1952), Furtado headed the joint ECLAC-BNDE group (1953-55) that would elect the infrastructure projects to be financed by the government, and that would later make JK invite Furtado to lead a government regional development agency (Furtado, 1998). The work of ECLAC-BNDE group became one of the basis over which the development program of president JK was organized. Later ECLAC-BNDE partnership would generate a program of development courses to be offered to government technicians in different spheres. This program had the support of Instituto Superior de Estudos Brasileiros (ISEB – Superior Institute of Brazilian Studies) – a government think tank constituted by Brazilian left wing intellectuals that were considered as the main formulators of the national-developmentalism concepts – and formed both government and private sector agents (Abreu, 2005).

ECLAC’s ‘ideas-force’ (Bielschowsky, 1998) challenged orthodox modernization theory in three basic ways: 1) it proposed a specific theorizing for underdevelopment and rejected the orthodox concept that it would represent a stage towards development (Furtado, 1961); 2) it rejected the theory of comparative advantages on international trade (Bielschowsky, 1998); 3) using the concept of center-periphery, it also rejected the country as the unit of analysis, hence considering the global system and its various interactions as the basic premise for analysis (Valenzuela and Valenzuela, 1978). This body of knowledge
developed by ECLAC became known as “structuralism”, also because it considered structural factors as the main cause of the chronic inflation of the region, instead of considering the monetary factors as preached by orthodox theory (Bielschowsky, 1987).

Furthermore, ECLAC developed, and Furtado was one the main architects, the original historical-structural method which in “essence was a perspective that searched for diachronic, historical and comparative relations ... deeply attentive to the behavior of social agents and the trajectory of institutions”, and that highlighted market imperfections generated by those interrelations along specific historical constructions (Bielschowsky, 1998: 21). In other words, the theorizing of ECLAC rejected the orthodox myth of the “invisible hand”, and it did not accept either the concept of “visible hand” (Chandler, 1977) by which the market if let alone would promote automatic balance. Much to the contrary, ECLAC’s premise was that in conditions of underdevelopment the tendency was for a chronic structural unbalance. In this situation, ECLAC proposed that the state should act as a planning body to induce private agents to promote development (Bielschowsky, 1998).

The proposition that development and underdevelopment are simultaneous processes, i.e., “the two faces of the historical evolution of the capitalist system” (Sunkel, 1972: 520) was the basis of the knowledge pursued by ECLAC and Furtado (1961). This theoretical concept from the South was contrary to the universal theory that claimed that underdevelopment was just a phase on the way to development that could be overcome (Rostow, 1960). According to orthodox modernization theory, underdeveloped countries had to follow orthodox methods and commit themselves to the “right knowledge” (Rostow, 1960). This American model was massively exported to Latin America, hence leading to an imposition on the knowledge promoted by ECLAC and Furtado. It illustrates how the “logic of coloniality, of the invisible, the darker side of modernity” (Mignolo, 2011: 206) works.

The propositions from ECLAC challenged as well the established orthodox theory of comparative advantages in international trade pointing out, instead, to a long term trend of deteriorating terms of trade (Prebisch, 1949). That proposition highlighted the asymmetry in international trade between industrialized products, mainly produced and exported by the North, and agricultural and mineral products, mostly extracted from the South and exported to the North (Prebisch, 1949). This was the basic assumption for ECLAC to propose for the region development through import substitution industrialization – ISI – that should be conducted under the leadership of the state (Bielschowsky, 1998).

Those propositions from ECLAC make clear that another rationale on development was being suggested from another locus of enunciation (Mignolo, 2011), and following a different implementation process led by the state, instead of being led by big enterprises in a free market as modernization theories from the North suggested (Chandler, 1962; Rostow, 1960). Therefore, ECLAC’s proposals followed another management logic associated with the development process: we may argue that in this logic the state manager could be a more important strategist than the private sector “visible hand” (Chandler, 1977).

The structuralism lenses promoted by ECLAC to foster local development in response to the dominant logic imposed by Euro-American theories, as a valuable example of the importance of South epistemologies to lead to global justice and multipolarity in the contemporary world (Santos, 2010), would later lead to what became known as dependency theory (DT). Celso Furtado, an important Brazilian academic, is considered one of the founders of this theory (Bielschowsky, 1987). Even in Brazil “dependence studies” have been ignored by local academics in management as an obvious result of the underlying process of geopolitical subalternization in which post-development studies also played a chief role. Taking the South as our locus of enunciation (Mignolo, 2011), we posit that this could have
been otherwise, and unveiling the knowledge produced by ECLAC and Furtado may help us create a space of dialogue between management and development.

By the end of the 1950s, the Cold War had spread to Latin America, and it reached a turning point, when, in 1959, the troops of Fidel Castro and Che Guevara conquered Cuba and transformed the political imaginary of Latin Americans (Grosfoguel, 2002). The threat of communist expansion all over the so-called Third World became, apparently, imminent. ECLAC at this moment was going through severe internal criticisms as the ISI model was not proving to be effective in income distribution. Influenced by left wing governments that took power in the region, ECLAC promoted an agenda that included agrarian reform that threatened established interests. Moreover it fostered regional integration through the creation of a free trade zone, named as ALALC (Bielschowsky, 1998).

Those ideas generated from ‘the outside of the inside’ could not be accepted, thus demarcating the decline of ECLAC’s influence in the governments of the region (Love, 2005). Simultaneously, as a social-democrat reply to the threat of communism expansion in the region, president JF Kennedy (1961-63) created the ‘Alliance for Progress’ which took over ECLAC’s agenda (Pollock, Kerner and Love, 2001). The Alliance was headed by the Organization of American States (OAS) that would farther deplete the influence of ECLAC.

As a reaction to the radicalization of left wing movements that spread over the region, and supported by US institutions (see Black, 1977 for the case of Brazil), a sequence of military dictatorships took over power across Latin America: Brazil, 1964; Argentina, 1966; Uruguay, 1967; and Chile, 1973. It became clear which management/development knowledge should prevail as military dictatorships closed down institutions that preached otherwise: in Brazil ‘Instituto Superior de Estudos Brasileiros (ISEB) was shut down in one of the first measures taken by the new government (Abreu, 2005), and the same happened in Chile to ‘Centro de Estudos Socio-Economicos’ (CESO) (Dos Santos, 2000). ECLAC office at Santiago was spared, though it suffered a short siege, suggesting that it was indeed part of the ‘outside from the inside’.

The original formulation of structuralism was based on economic historiography of Latin American countries, mostly by Latino-American economists (Beigel, 2010), i.e., from the locus of enunciation of the South, and for the implementation of policies that would counter its backwardness, which was partially attributed to developed countries from the North. Afterwards, it was reformulated under different Marxist concepts as DT (Bresser-Pereira, 2011), leading to a furthering from local realities and praxis. The new military governments, supported by the state-based imperial capitalist order led by the US against the expansion of communism (Dos Santos, 2000), shrugged of Marxist formulations (with the exception of Peru; Dos Santos, 2000), condemning DT to become encircled in an academic debate, that successfully drifted it away from local realities: “the socialist version no longer offered alternatives to the problems of the region” (Martins, 2011: 259). Pinochet’s military coup in Chile in 1973, where ECLAC (still) is located, shuttered off any possibility of ECLAC’s formulating from the ‘outside of the inside’. The consequent implementation of liberal reforms in Chile, after the coup, in what would become a neoliberal experiment of the state-based imperial capitalist order which ended up to invade the world as from the late 1970s (Bresser-Pereira, 2011), and provided further conditions for the worldwide establishment of the market-based representation of managerialism and the invisibility of the “dark side” of a particular version of state-based capitalism, left no room for doubts: ‘the inside (re)covered up the outside’.
Final considerations

We engaged in this paper a critical historical decolonial perspective through border thinking (Mignolo, 2000; 2007; 2011) in order to bring to the fore the contributions of both ECLAC and Celso Furtado, and to show its chief importance for the constitution of a pluriversal field of MOK and a multipolar world. More specifically, we discussed that dependence is a missing link for us to (re)connect management and development from another locus of enunciation, since “development in the era of globalization is no longer competing with communism” (Mignolo, 2011: 130). To the other hand, we claim that we need a decolonial perspective to shift the geography of reasoning, thus moving to the borders (Mignolo, 2011) to recognize that ECLAC has introduced into the debate power and political issues that are normally not taken into consideration in MOK. One of the main contributions of this article is to incentivize other researchers to explore border thinking as a method to (re)frame other processes of knowledge unveiling from the South, and the North, that have been covered up by epistemic coloniality (Ibarra-Colado, 2006).

We have highlighted that the knowledge and training ECLAC promoted throughout Latin America launched a new model of state-based capitalism. That may be contrasted with the disenchantment of post-development authors in the capacity of the state in having a prominent role in a ‘post-development era’, and with the fact that “considerable faith in postdevelopment circles is placed in liaising with and learning from grassroots and social movements” (Sylvester, 1999: 710). We argue that these proposals from ECLAC, produced from the colonial difference, implied a different logic of management associated with development and that dependence studies provide a link from where to (re)encounter these two concepts to foster the replacement of Eurocentric universality by geo-epistemic pluriversalism. Through a decolonial perspective and border thinking, we claim that market-based capitalism and stated-based imperial capitalism, which is its dark and invisible side, are part of the same phenomenon, the same way was as modernity and coloniality are (Mignolo, 2011).

Dependence studies from Latin America antecedes Euro-American postcolonialism and this explains why postcolonialism fails to address the (international) political economy issues which constitute the core of dependence. Our historical analysis of dependence studies through border thinking shows, thus, that much of the contribution from Latin America has been downplayed by the successful trajectory of (Anglo-American) post-colonialism, and as a result of the absence of a critical perspective from the borders of the South which takes coloniality as a chief condition of modernity (Mignolo, 2000; 2011).

We argue that decolonizing the knowledge produced by ECLAC and by Celso Furtado is a way to foster critical responses within MOK from Latin America in an era demarcated by the decay of the Euro-American knowledge, and the rise of state-capitalism led by the so called emerging economies, and to foster the construction of an-other debate on development and capitalism from the borders of Western managerialism. We hope that the discussion produced in this article supports the idea that “the Third World is not only an area to be studied but a place (or places) from where to speak” (Mignolo, 1993: 123), and that it incentivizes other researchers to escape from the situation we believe occurred to dependence studies when reframed as DT, that “the periphery can now reimport the product it originally exported, and leave behind a surplus of cultural prestige and strength in the core” (Chirot and Hall, 1982: 90).
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