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ABSTRACT

Research objective: To make theoretical approximations between the field of Social Management and Southern Epistemologies.

Theoretical framework: Social Management represents an alternative to hegemonic organizational thinking. Through public spheres, permeated by participatory and dialogic actions, the aim is to serve the common good of society. Southern Epistemologies represent an alternative to the epistemological paradigm of modern science, the colonial, patriarchal and capitalist side.

Results: Just as Social Management seeks emancipation as its purpose, Southern Epistemologies present emancipatory potential, by constituting political and epistemic guidance, which arises from knowledge about the fight against capitalism/colonialism/patriarchy.

Originality: There is a need to advance in the understanding of Social Management, based on its original epistemological and decolonial axiological sense, considering the emergence of debates about inequalities and diversities. Therefore, Southern Epistemologies become relevant to reflect the field, as it admits the knowledge produced in modernity and is based on a counter-hegemonic conception.

Theoretical contributions: From the perspective of Southern Epistemologies, Social Management, as a possibility of epistemological decoloniality, becomes more appropriate to the Latin American context and closer to a dialogical management that seeks to free individuals and promote equality through promotion of the common good. Thus, space is opened for the appreciation and validation of knowledge built in Latin America.
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PENSANDO A GESTÃO SOCIAL A PARTIR DAS EPISTEMOLOGIAS DO SUL

RESUMO

Objetivo da pesquisa: Realizar aproximações teóricas entre o campo da Gestão Social e as Epistemologias do Sul.
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Thinking Social Management from the Epistemologies of the South

Enquadramento teórico: A Gestão Social representa uma alternativa ao pensamento organizacional hegemônico. Por meio das esferas públicas, permeadas por ações participativas e dialógicas, objetiva-se atender ao bem comum da sociedade. As Epistemologias do Sul representam uma alternativa ao paradigma epistemológico da ciência moderna, o lado colonial, patriarcal e capitalista.

Resultados: Assim como a Gestão Social busca a emancipação como finalidade, as Epistemologias do Sul apresentam potencial emancipador, ao constituir orientação política e epistêmica, que nasce do conhecimento acerca da luta contra o capitalismo/colonialismo/patriarcado.

Originalidade: Há a necessidade de avançar na compreensão da Gestão Social, a partir de seu sentido originário epistemológico e axiológico decolonial, considerando a emergência dos debates acerca das desigualdades e diversidades. Logo, as Epistemologias do Sul tornam-se relevantes para refletir o campo, pois admite o conhecimento produzido na modernidade e parte de uma concepção contra hegemônica.

Contribution teóricas: Sob o olhar das Epistemologias do Sul, a Gestão Social, como uma possibilidade de decolonialidade epistemológica, torna-se mais adequada ao contexto latino-americano e mais próxima de uma gestão dialógica que busca libertar os indivíduos e promover igualdade por meio da promoção do bem comum. Assim, abre-se espaço para a valorização e validação do conhecimento construído na América Latina.


1 INTRODUCTION

Social Management, discussed in Brazil since the 1990s, is opposed to strategic management, outlining a perspective of dialogical action, based on Habermas' communicative action, and is guided by a more participatory management, whose decision-making process is exercised by different subjects of the society (Tenório, 1998; 2008a). The social qualifies management, characterizing it as the privileged space for social relations, so that all individuals have the right to speak, without coercion (Tenório, 2008a). The participation of subjects is expanded, especially for those excluded from the system, incompatible with the dominant logic perpetuated, mainly by the market.

This change in the form of management is in line with the entire situation representing a time in need of a new perspective for public management. In this sense, Social Management is configured as a type of management whose nature is hybrid, contextual and linked to the socio-historical and political context (Gianella, 2012). The scenario of its emergence corroborates this argument, as the starting point of Social Management is only possible through a process of political redemocratization, which began in Brazil in the mid-1980s, and which promotes pressure for citizenship rights, modifying the relationship State-society (Dagnino, 2010; Oliveira, 2012). In this relationship, Tenório (2005) suggests inverting the positions of the categories for society-State, understanding that society must be the protagonist of this relationship. It is from this period onwards that the participation of civil society grows, linked to the decentralization process, which strengthens, in addition to the democratization of public power, the promotion of active citizenship (Tenório, 2008a).

As management is intrinsically linked to the social context, this type of management is relevant due to the limitation of other models of political and economic organization in fully meeting republican needs and the common good of society. Furthermore, there is an inequality arising from the political decision-making process that focuses on preserving the interests of
those responsible for financing elected officials (Tenório & Araújo, 2020). Social Management, however, since 2016 - when the constitutional precepts of 1988 were heavily attacked - has had its possibility of achievement compromised, given the context that marks public management on the national scene (Tenório & Araújo, 2020; Tenório & Teixeira, 2021).

As Social Management cannot be considered apart from the history and context in which it arises and develops, theoretical reflections around the field also need to align perspectives that allude to the dynamics of developing countries. In this sense, there are authors who treat Social Management from a decolonial perspective (Hernandez & Cançado, 2017; Iwamoto, Petarly, & Cançado, 2022; Tenório & Araújo, 2020). In this sense, Social Management can be thought of as a result of decolonial thinking, since it contrasts the classical conceptions of administration and the scientific hegemony of the field. In historical terms, Social Management comes from Brazil's colonial relations and its contemporary history in the 20th century, marked by the government of Getúlio Vargas and its protective measures; by the military regimes 1964-1985 – which deprive citizens of participation; and by the 1988 Constitution – a mark of the legitimate exercise of citizenship (Hernandez & Cançado, 2017).

Faced with Brazil's political and social regression, which was emphasized in 2016, Tenório and Araújo (2020) address the need to advance in the understanding of Social Management, based on its original epistemological and decolonial axiological meaning, considering, above all, that debates about inequalities and diversities are pressing and require alternatives. It is this conception, far from Eurocentrism, that includes the excluded and recognizes their knowledge, potential and values. A line of thought within this vision, associated with Social Management, becomes relevant to reflect the field, namely, the Epistemologies of the South (Leal & Corá, 2020; Tenório & Araújo, 2020). This is an epistemological proposal that admits the knowledge produced in modernity and that starts from a counter-hegemonic conception.

Southern Epistemologies, which can be understood as a subaltern and alternative epistemological proposal, arising from social struggles against oppression, oppose capitalism, colonialism and patriarchy, which still today make up a hegemonic paradigm of domination (Gentili, 2018; Santos, Araújo, & Baumgarten, 2016). Thus, they seek to denounce the sovereignty of modern science, which excludes and silences peoples and cultures dominated by capitalism and colonialism (Gomes, 2012). In this way, expressions and forms of knowledge production originating from the Portuguese reality, Latin American, African and Asian contexts are valued and recognized (Gentili, 2018), whether scientific, artisanal, practical, popular or empirical (Gomes, 2018).

By questioning the bases of modern epistemic relations, Southern Epistemologies contribute to the decolonization of knowledge and integrate varied perspectives, coming from different places and disciplines (Santos & Meneses, 2010). And with this same perspective, the field of Social Management develops, whether through the articulation of knowledge, academic or non-academic, multi and interdisciplinary, constructed with and by actors (Schommer & França Filho, 2008; 2010). He positions himself, therefore, in line with Southern Epistemologies. Both concepts are contrary to dominant administrative thinking, which excludes, causes inequalities and contributes to perpetuating the status quo.

In view of the above, Southern Epistemologies, as well as Social Management, play a relevant role in the deconstruction of what is hegemonically recognized as the basis of legitimate knowledge (and which, therefore, underpins decision-making in the most diverse spheres of life). Furthermore, both proposals also share the need for integration of those individuals who have historically been subordinated, with the aim of correcting the economic and social inequalities that have arisen. Therefore, a research problem emerges from these considerations: How can Southern Epistemologies contribute to broadening the theoretical lens...
that underpins contemporary Social Management? To this end, this essay aims to make theoretical approaches between the field of Social Management and Southern Epistemologies.

The methodological procedures of this work were based on the use of the qualitative method in the form of a theoretical essay. In this sense, it is a technique that promotes reflection and discussion about a certain topic. For Meneghetti (2011), the essay is a means of analysis and reflections in relation to the object. According to the author, the essay form is the way in which new knowledge is incubated, it is not an instrument of identity between subject and object, but it is a means of apprehending reality. It concludes that in this writing format the empirical is already grasped by the essayist's consciousness. Bertero (2011) emphasizes that the theoretical essay is characterized by breaking the schematic and systematic logic of positive science, thus promoting deep reflections that generate different ways of generating knowledge.

For the development of this essay, a literature review was carried out regarding the two thematic axes presented, with the purpose of understanding how they are related. Therefore, to meet the proposed objective, in addition to this introduction, the essay presents general considerations about the field of Social Management and its current configuration; the description of the Southern Epistemologies proposal; the theoretical association between the reflections presented; and finally, the final considerations.

2 SOCIAL MANAGEMENT: A REVIEW OF THE FIELD

Discussions around Social Management emerged in Brazil in the 1990s, mainly due to the favorable socio-political context of the time, a moment marked by redemocratization, in which civil society acquired a relevant role in the reform of the State and when new ways of configuring public management (Freitas, Freitas, & Ferreira, 2016). During this period, there was a kind of reinvention of governance and governability, through a new relationship that began to exist between civil society, the State and the market, with the prioritization of new dynamics of participation (Allebrandt, Siedenberg, Sausen, & Deckert, 2011). Particularly noteworthy is the promulgation of the 1988 Constitution, the citizen constitution, which goes beyond the vision of participation restricted to electoral cycles (Tenório, 2012; Tenório & Araújo, 2020; Tenório & Teixeira, 2021). Since this milestone, civil society institutions, social movements and public policies have experienced an expansion of their civil and political freedoms, as well as state capabilities in the search for national development and well-being of the population (Leal & Corá, 2020).

Social Management represents “a theoretical and practical alternative to hegemonic organizational thinking” (Cançado, Tenório & Pereira, 2011, p. 698). In this sense, it is opposite to strategic management, that which serves the market, technobureaucratic and monologic. It advocates, through public spheres, achieving the common good of society, based on more participatory, dialogical actions, whose decision-making process is shared between different subjects (Tenório, 1998, 2012). It is a new way of thinking about management, present in the relationship between State-market-society, and based on transparency and effective participation of all individuals involved in decision-making.

In this sense, Cançado, Vilella and Sausen (2016) delve deeper into identifying the differences between strategic management and social management. According to the authors, the rationality inherent to each theoretical front is subject to analysis and approximations in their dialectical relationships. However, the authors warn that, despite being antagonistic, they should be thought of as complementary constructions in balance.

There are intrinsic characteristics to Social Management that define its achievement. It takes place in public spheres – inserted in the world of life – which are the spaces where communication flows (content, positions, opinions) and deliberation between the State, society and market occur (Habermas, 2011; Tenório, 2008a). Decision-making – collective, free from
coercion – is based on deliberative democracy. It is defined, according to Luchmann (2002), as a process of institutionalization of a set of practices and rules, which confer legitimacy on political decisions through the principles of deliberative citizenship – inclusion, pluralism, participatory equality, autonomy, common good, control Social. It is these decisions that affect social inequalities and reorder the traditional logic of power.

Still on the characteristics of Social Management, its form of rationality can be defined, which is guided by Habermasian communicative action. This is the way in which social relations are established, with language being the path to rational understanding (Tenório, 2006; 2008b). The foundations of dialogicity and intersubjectivity also derive from communicative action, translated as the ability to communicate and understand people (Cançado, 2011; Cançado, Pereira, & Tenório, 2015).

It is important to highlight that the realization of these characteristics in Social Management occurs at different levels, never completely, due to power relations and social and cultural inequalities that prevail in the Brazilian scenario (Oliveira, Cançado, & Pereira, 2010). But even if they manifest themselves at “low levels”, these characteristics, when present in the communication and decision-making processes of communities, contribute greatly to achieve success in the pursuit of collective interests.

One of the main results caused by the exercise of Social Management consists of human emancipation (Oliveira, Cançado, & Pereira, 2010). The individual understands his active role, as a worker claims his participation in the decision-making process of the system-company relationship; and as a social subject, in addition to contributing and exercising his role as a voter, he acquires a participative and supportive presence in the direction of his community (Tenório, 1998). According to Teixeira, Alcântara, Garcia and Pereira (2019), emancipation in the context of Social Management refers to the search for autonomy, which promotes participation and forms the critical consciousness of individuals – who make up society and public spheres, in a joint effort to build the common good. For the authors, citizens, at this juncture, become aware of their duties and rights, being able to dialogue, reflect and participate. The achievement of successful Social Management expands from an emancipatory perspective when the actors involved strengthen the relationship between emancipation and well-understood interests (Oliveira, Vilella, & Sausen, 2016).

Considering its paradigmatic character, Social Management is framed in the paradigms of Radical Humanism, proposed by Burrel and Morgan, in 1979, and in the Structural Conflict and Interpretive paradigms, proposed by Jones, in 1993 (Cançado, 2011, Cançado, Tenório, & Pereira, 2015). Its ontology is considered nominalist, since the individual constructs their own (subjective) reality. In epistemological terms, Social Management is anti-positivist, since the researcher also assumes the role of research subject, composing reality and also acting on it. Regarding the methodology, this is ideographic, as it is necessary for the subject to be able to freely reveal their nature and characteristics (Cançado, 2011).

There is also another perspective that frames Social Management within the circle of epistemic matrices, proposed by Paes de Paula (2016). In this proposal, according to Oliveira (2021), instead of defining a static quadrant, there is a more open and dynamic design, which defines a dialogue between different sociological approaches, and the transit between the varied epistemic matrices. This is because Social Management, as a complex and comprehensive field, is incompatible with logics that present insurmountable boundaries of incommensurable paradigms.

Finally, it is necessary to position Social Management in its current context. As a social construction, Social Management is established through the tension between competing corporate projects – one prioritizing the development of capital and the other the development of citizenship (Toretta, 2018). The field today faces major challenges. According to Leal and Corá (2020), the organizations that allow its development are, mainly, after 2016, harshly
attacked by the government, such as the presidential measures that reduced the performance of public policy councils, the reduction of sources of public resources for their activities, the limitation of donations from companies—due to the economic crisis. There is an attempt to extinguish democratic spaces by cutting resources (Tenório & Teixeira, 2021).

In addition to the above, “social movements are on the back foot in the face of measures to criminalize their activities and teaching and research institutions have been converted into pariahs of the Ministry of Education” (Leal & Corá, 2020, p. 215). Contrary to the scenario of its emergence, Social Management is faced with an unfavorable context that limits its ability to undertake efforts to make effective changes, in favor of citizenship and the common good. However, there is an attempt to politically reconstruct this situation, which seeks to integrate society and achieve its participation, in the task of creating plural spaces that value science and equal opportunities. Corroborating the aforementioned authors, the study by Alcântara, Cabral, Muzy and Oliveira (2018) points out that from the perspective of social management, cooperation between organizations and between social sectors is important for the coordination of hybrid spaces and logics.

The aforementioned bleak panorama was emphasized from 2016 onwards, when Brazil went “through a process in which the constitutional precepts of 1988 no longer seem to make sense” (Tenório & Araújo, 2020, p. 903). That said, Tenório and Teixeira (2021) state that there is a gap between the concept of Social Management and the paths taken by national public management, permeated by social, economic and political uncertainties, accentuated by the Covid-19 pandemic. However, Social Management, even in the face of a totally unfavorable situation, still constitutes an alternative compatible with the promotion of the common good, through dialogic and solidarity mechanisms. As Leal and Corá (2020) rightly state, the path to be taken, as a crisis and opportunity, is the time to consolidate Social Management, whether as an epistemological development or as a practical field, where social technologies and management and intervention methodologies are produced. in social reality.

3 EPISTEMOLOGIES OF THE SOUTH: (RE)INTEGRATING THE EXCLUDED

Decolonial thinking corresponds to the resistance of those people who have been historically silenced by modernity and coloniality, who fight for their political, social, cultural and epistemic affirmation and legitimacy (Quijano, 2010; Mignolo, 2007; 2017). According to Pereira and Paim (2018), this is a critical-social perspective, going beyond the limits of both the class marker and the linear and evolutionary time that characterize hegemonic thought since the Enlightenment. The indelible marks of the colonial situation simply did not abandon the colonized peoples, considering the colonial process that today unfolds in the coloniality of power. Decoloniality continues to support the need to continue along the path of liberation from colonial oppression (Reis & Andrade, 2018; Torre, Benegiamo, & Dal Gobbo, 2020).

Decolonial thinking conceives colonization as a “prolonged event”, made up of countless ruptures. With it, the aim is not to destroy the colonial, to reverse it, but rather to provoke a continuous position of transgressing and insurgents, as a continuous struggle (Colaço, 2012). He proposes a break with the thoughts inscribed in minds and bodies over generations—such as Greco-Roman traditions—in order to incorporate the thinking of indigenous people and black people, for example, and understand them as legitimate epistemologies that make up the culture of those colonized peoples (Costa Neto, 2016). Decoloniality arises, then, from the moment in which

The process of coloniality declined from the emergence of decolonial responses, that is, responses from people who were not content with being told what to do and who they were. Today decoloniality is everywhere, it is a connector between hundreds,
perhaps thousands of organized responses that detach themselves from modernity and Western civilization and reconnect with the legacies that people want to preserve, with a view to the affirmative modes of existence that they want live (Mignolo, 2019, p. 14).

Decoloniality is “the necessary response both to the fallacies and fictions of the promises of progress and development that modernity contemplates, and to the violence of coloniality” (Mignolo, 2017, p.13). It represents a form of resistance and resignification of what is known as valid and legitimate, be it knowledge, cultures, modes of production and socialization. According to Torre, Benegiamo and Dal Gobbo (2020), although the notion of decoloniality has a complex history, the term, in its current use, is the result of a reflection that arises within the great transition experienced by Latin American society from the years 1970. Within this new vision, we find the Epistemologies of the South, as a critique of the forms of knowledge that predominated throughout history.

Southern Epistemologies represent an alternative to the epistemological paradigm of modern science, a vision that contests dominant Western values and practices. It is an alternative to the epistemologies of the North, the colonial, patriarchal and capitalist side, which consider the Eurocentric epistemological North as the only source of valid knowledge (Santos, 2014; 2019). Southern Epistemologies constitute a proposal to expand political imagination beyond the intellectual and political exhaustion of the Global North, translated into the inability to face the challenges of this century, which expand the possibilities of rethinking the world based on knowledge and practices from the Global South and draw new maps where what was excluded by a history of epistemicide fits (Santos, Araújo, & Baumgarten, 2016, p. 15).

The South, with its epistemic challenges, aims to repair the losses that were historically caused by capitalism and its colonial relationship. It includes, geographically, those countries and regions subjected to European colonialism and that have not achieved economic development, such as in the global North. However, there are exceptions in the geographic North, of classes and social groups – workers, women, indigenous people, black people – subjected to capitalist and global domination. And in the same way, there are also exceptions in the geographic South, of small local elites, benefiting from this domination (Santos & Meneses, 2010).

In this sense, this South, called “anti-imperial South”, is much more epistemological than geographic, whose people share the struggles against injustice, oppression and destruction, arising from capitalism, colonialism and patriarchy (Meneses & Bidasca, 2018; Santos, 2014; 2019). The objective is to reconstitute what had been erased from history, in favor of hegemonic perspectives that increasingly reproduce social and economic inequalities, and all the prejudices arising from this distorted vision.

The epistemic sovereignty of modern science suppressed all other forms of knowledge, causing epistemicide. This means that some local knowledge began to be devalued and others began to be subjected to a logic of hierarchy, erasing the various perspectives of the different existing cultures (Gomes, 2012; Santos, 2014; 2019). In this sense, Southern Epistemologies emerge as a response, making what had not even been considered knowledge by dominant thought emerge and be valued (Santos, 2014; 2019). They fit into what is called ecology of knowledge, which presupposes a coexistence of different knowledge. This concept is configured as an ecology, “because it is based on the recognition of the plurality of heterogeneous knowledge (one of them being modern science) and on sustainable and dynamic
interactions between them, without compromising their autonomy” (Santos & Meneses, 2010, p. 44).

To achieve the ecology of knowledge, “the constellation of knowledge that populates the world, inquires, rivals and enriches science” (Gomes, 2018, p. 516), Santos (2018a) mentions that it is necessary to produce a sociology of absences, a sociology of emergencies and an intercultural translation (Gomes, 2018; Santos & Meneses, 2010). The sociology of absences aims to incorporate denied and hidden experiences, while the sociology of emergencies aims to incorporate the new, what is not yet there (Añón, 2018).

The sociology of absences identifies and values social experiences already available in the world and which are considered non-existent by rationality and hegemonic knowledge. In turn, the sociology of emergencies identifies signs that point to future experiences and that would equally be ignored by dominant thinking (Santos, 2002; 2004; 2018a). These are complementary ways of highlighting knowledge considered non-scientific, local knowledge and creative initiatives, which also carry numerous contributions.

The aforementioned intercultural translation refers to the mechanisms of correspondence between knowledge, which through reciprocal intelligibility identifies complementarities, contradictions, common points and alternative perspectives. This breaks with the idea of incommensurability between cultures. By identifying similar concerns and underlying assumptions across cultures, it is possible to improve interactions and strengthen social movements, coming from varied contexts, that fight equally against capitalism, colonialism and patriarchy, in favor of social justice and human dignity (Santos, 2006; 2014; 2019). Intercultural translation promotes, through language, a rapprochement and integration of those who are separated, but who fight for the same objective.

Given all this construction around the Epistemologies of the South, it appears that these only exist because the Epistemologies of the North position themselves as universal. There is no objective of establishing dichotomous and excluding relationships, since this vision would refute even the proposal of Southern Epistemologies. From the moment that knowledge from the South, as well as from the North, constitutes a horizontal relationship, Once the conditions for intercultural translation are protected, it will be possible to explore the potential of all knowledge, in favor of building a fair society (Santos, 2014). The effort must always be to value the diversity of knowledge, making the intentionality and intelligibility of social practices become broad and democratic (Santos & Meneses, 2010). Thus, by promoting plural knowledge, Southern Epistemologies contribute to the decolonization of knowledge.

4 CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL MANAGEMENT THROUGH THE LENS OF SOUTH EPISTEMOLOGIES

Given the reflections surrounding Social Management today and the proposal of Southern Epistemologies, it is possible to weave some theoretical-conceptual approximations between the two propositions. Such approaches are intended to show that Social Management has common interests in its conceptions in relation to Southern Epistemologies, as they seek to present alternatives to hegemonic and dominant thoughts that exclude what is different and peripheral. In this sense, it is possible to identify convergences and similarities between the two theoretical concepts, namely:

- Social Management constitutes an alternative to strategic management, which is built from a critical vision of Eurocentric administrative science, which is not capable of meeting the multiplicity of demands of the current reality, which is immersed in social and economic crises. In turn, Southern Epistemologies oppose the Eurocentric epistemological North as the only source of valid knowledge.
• Social Management aims to promote horizontality in knowledge, extinguishing any attempt at hierarchy and hegemony. It also seeks to value non-traditional knowledge – which has been forgotten or not considered as legitimate knowledge – promoting what resembles an ecology of knowledge. Southern Epistemologies contest dominant values and practices, arguing against the adversities of colonial domination.

• Southern Epistemologies can contribute to Social Management by questioning its still hegemonic theoretical bases, as it highlights knowledge that has been suppressed throughout history and those that can be relegated according to the prevailing social conception (sociologies of absences and emergencies) as well as legitimate and relevant.

• Social Management, as a result of Brazil's colonial relations, becomes one of the alternative knowledge constructed in contemporary times and urgent in today's reality, which rises as a type of knowledge from the South to the South, in counterpoint to a project of colonialist and patriarchal domination which relegates the possibility of global learning.

• The intercultural translation suggested by Southern Epistemologies uses the mechanisms of dialogicity and intelligibility, used as a basis for deliberation in Social Management. The objective is to make languages understandable, through an informed understanding, so that a consensus can be reached in decision-making, moving away from the traditional idea of an unlimited superiority of the desire of the majority over the minority.

• Social Management and Southern Epistemologies aim to integrate those who have been excluded throughout history, by capitalist and colonial domination, such as indigenous people, women, the poor, black people; and contribute to their struggles.

• Southern Epistemologies as a theoretical lens for interpreting Social Management contribute to its potential for human emancipation, especially by arguing that all social experience produces and reproduces knowledge. Social Management is considered a product of decolonial thinking, as it breaks with the classic positions of Administration and scientific hegemony, which dictates how knowledge should be constituted, as happens in Latin America (Hernandez & Cançado, 2017). Its alternative position is established in opposition to strategic management, whose practice causes typically colonial results, social exclusion and inequality. The instrumentalist character of strategic management is compatible with the logics that interpret the concentration of capital and the consequent acquisition of power as legitimate forms of domination of the various spheres of life.

The decolonization of knowledge becomes the main relational aspect between Social Management and Southern Epistemologies, as shown in Figure 1. The exercise of Social Management is possible when the different actors that make up civil society participate and articulate themselves dialogically around of their knowledge, in association with the market and the State. It is a type of management that takes place in everyday social practices, whose actors use different knowledge, especially non-academic knowledge, to achieve their desires, which translate into the resolution of local problems, with the aim of promoting the well-being of the community. Therefore, its association with the ecology of knowledge is suggested (Santos, 2002; Santos & Meneses, 2010), admitting non-scientific knowledge as an alternative (Schommer & França Filho, 2008). In this way, the coexistence between scientific and popular knowledge, contextualized knowledge, which is often full of creativity and contributes to the resolution of social problems, is preserved.
The aforementioned knowledge, scientific and non-scientific, does not claim superiority between them, as is common in Northern Epistemologies. This knowledge always interacts in a horizontal relationship. Differences are admitted, but both contribute to development. Freire's own reference (1987), used as a foundation in the field of Social Management, recognizes that learning goes beyond the sphere of teaching, configuring a collective construction of practices, knowledge and meanings. All actors, in this construction, respect each other and accept the different knowledge they carry. It is through dialogue that this knowledge multiplies, both through action and reflection.

The reference to dialogue, as a form of interaction between individuals to exchange knowledge, as mentioned, is related to intercultural translation (Santos, 2006; 2014; 2019). For the exchange of knowledge to occur, it is necessary to understand the stories and cultures behind the individuals who carry it. It is through this translation that dialogues can be established between the South and the North. Intercultural translation, in this way, “enables mutual intelligibility between the culturally diverse social experiences of the world, both existing and other possible ones, in accordance with the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergencies” (Santos, 2017, p. 268). Mediations and negotiations are built between different peoples, with the aim of intensifying the struggles against oppression (Santos, 2017).

Dialogicity is the basis for the existence of Social Management. It imposes the existence of a broad dialogue, in which everyone speaks, listens and is able to understand each other. The intersubjectivity inherent to the communication process allows an informed understanding to occur, as it will be necessary to understand the rules, structures and contexts behind the
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statements (Cançado, 2011; Cançado, Pereira, & Tenório, 2015). It is through dialogue that Social Management takes place and decisions are made. It is also through it that this form of management can contribute to the implementation of processes that assist in the various struggles waged by minorities.

These struggles supported by Social Management and Southern Epistemologies aim to give a voice to the excluded, to minorities. One of the requirements that determines the identification of Social Management in democratic spaces, for example, is inclusion. It allows those excluded from the system to engage in public decision-making spheres and represent collective interests (Tenório, Villela, Dias, & Lima, 2009). In the same way, Southern Epistemologies want to (re)integrate social groups that have historically been excluded, through domination, through the construction of knowledge and debate on various silenced topics. For Santos (2018b), these oppressed groups suffer from political invisibility and social violence and need to be included in an “inclusive way”, that is, based on their points of view. In this sense, traditional forms of “inclusion” are disregarded, which in fact exclude, because they subject the knowledge of these groups to the canons of the North, as they are considered inferior.

Another point of association between the themes discussed here concerns emancipation. In the same way that Social Management seeks the emancipation of individuals as its aim, Southern Epistemologies present an emancipatory potential, by functioning as a political and epistemic orientation, which arises from knowledge about the fight against capitalism, colonialism and patriarchy (Santos, 2018b). Emancipation for Social Management defines the ability to free yourself from someone's tutelage and think for yourself, with the aim of achieving autonomy (Cançado, 2011). In this way, there is no way to think and conceive knowledge based on knowledge exclusive to the North. It is therefore necessary to also consider other perspectives, as Southern Epistemologies propose.

Finally, it is worth highlighting the epistemological bases under which Social Management was conceived. Hernandez and Cançado (2017) mention that although the epistemology of Social Management is based on the parameters of the European vision, from the perspective of decoloniality it is also necessary to consider that knowledge specific to pre-colonial America and which has not undergone a process of systematization or methodological validation, imposed by European science. Therefore, for the authors, this knowledge is also valid when responding to and explaining social configurations.

This Eurocentric epistemological reference explains, in part, the difficulties and uncertainties that arise when Social Management – with its complexities, pluralities and hybridisms – tries to fit within the paradigmatic logic (Oliveira, 2021). The need to adapt to decolonial thinking, as well as Southern Epistemologies, is even more urgent when considering the Brazilian context and its democratic weaknesses. In this sense, theoretical-conceptual approaches such as the one proposed in this work are relevant to contribute to the advancement of the field and, consequently, strengthen it. Furthermore, the arguments constructed here contribute to Social Management constituting an empirical theoretical proposal to live with the specificities of Brazil's sociopolitical scenario.

5 CONCLUSION

This essay proposed to expand the theoretical lens that underlies contemporary Social Management, based on the Epistemologies of the South. It is considered that decolonial thinking, which includes the Epistemologies of the South, proved to be appropriate, as it shares the criticism of colonial oppression and hegemony of science, and also the desire for the democratization of knowledge. In this sense, it aligns with Social Management, since this
opposition gives rise to the idea and presence of social participation, through dialogicity (Cançado, 2011; Cançado, Pereira, & Tenório, 2015; Oliveira, 2012).

With the aim of making theoretical-conceptual approaches between Social Management and Southern Epistemologies, points of convergence were identified. Considering original aspects, both proposals originate from social struggles against oppression; fruit of a reflection on the transition experienced by Latin American society (1970); as a counterpoint to capitalism, colonialism and patriarchy and the hegemonic paradigm of domination (dominant thought, dominant values and practices of the West). Regarding their objectives, the following points are shared: they seek to denounce the sovereignty of modern science (hegemonic deconstruction); question the bases of modern epistemic relationships; (re)integrate social groups that have historically been excluded; bring together and integrate those who are separated; repair the losses that were historically caused by capitalism.

Social Management and Southern Epistemologies constitute alternative proposals, which start from a critical-social perspective, and propose an expansion of political imagination, as forms of resistance and resignification. The way in which knowledge should be conceived and perpetuated also proved to be a relevant topic of analysis, based on the decolonization of knowledge. There is an integration of varied perspectives, coming from different places and disciplines, which makes what was not even considered as knowledge by dominant thought emerge and be valued. A coexistence of different knowledge is assumed, based on a mutual exchange, which makes it possible to understand the histories and cultures behind the subjects who carry them.

Social Management was described as a possibility of epistemological decoloniality. From the perspective of Southern Epistemologies, Social Management becomes more appropriate to the Latin American context and closer to a dialogical management that seeks to free individuals and promote equality through the promotion of the common good. The rupture that the new perspective causes in hegemonic administrative thinking opens space for the valorization and validation of knowledge originating and constructed in Latin America, a South that is resurfacing to correct colonial inequalities and injustices.

Social Management longs for achievements that reinforce the dialogue between different actors and their most varied knowledge, whether coming from modern science or everyday popular practices. And the Epistemologies of the South, through the ecology of knowledge, confirm that this exchange is favorable for the rise of new knowledge, which translates the stories of peoples hitherto suppressed by colonization. People who were subjected to social, economic, cultural and epistemological domination, and learned that their ways of life, knowledge and opinions are subordinate and insufficient.

Southern Epistemologies reinforce the aim of emancipating Social Management. It is achieved when subjects, through language and education, become able to give their opinion freely and critically. What's more, they become emancipated when they become empowered and recognize the value they also present to global society, when they expose their knowledge and use it to expand the possibilities that everyday reality presents.

Exploring possible points of divergence between Social Management and Southern Epistemologies, based on a critical reading of the outlines that construct these perspectives, can also contribute to updating and strengthening the theory of the field. Furthermore, future research can also explore empirical cases that translate decolonial aspects in dealing with Social Management, since theory and practice are intertwined to advance knowledge.
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