FORUM

"TUPI, OR NOT TUPI THAT IS THE QUESTION": AMERINDIAN PERSPECTIVISM AND ORGANIZATIONAL STUDIES

"Tupi, or not Tupi that is the question": Perspectivismo ameríndio e Estudos Organizacionais

"Tupi, or not Tupi that is the question": Perspectivismo amerindio y Estudios Organizacionales

ABSTRACT

This essay discusses the possibilities that Viveiros de Castro's concept of Amerindian perspectivism offers to Organizational Studies. Oswald de Andrade's Anthropophagous Manifesto is the guiding thread of our investigation. Amerindian perspectivism suggests a reflexive shift to the position occupied by the object of inquiry, which, thus, becomes the subject from which we must question our own premises. What matters is knowing how our subject/former object perceives the categories/concepts we created to describe it. For Viveiros de Castro, the reflexive displacement should occur using a controlled equivocation. Therefore, we must be reflexive on the consequences that our onto-epistemological choices will have on our research from the Other's point of view. The concepts of reflexive displacement and controlled equivocation have much to contribute to the construction of the other in Organizational Studies and to the concept of border thinking in decolonial studies.

KEYWORDS | Amerindian perspectivism, anthropophagy, border thinking, controlled equivocation, reflexive displacement.

RESUMO

Esse ensaio discorre sobre as possibilidades que o conceito de perspectivismo ameríndio de Viveiros de Castro oferece aos Estudos Organizacionais. O "Manifesto antropófago" de Oswald de Andrade é o fio condutor de nossa investigação. O perspectivismo ameríndio sugere um deslocamento reflexivo para a posição ocupada pelo objeto de investigação que, assim, se torna o sujeito a partir do qual devemos questionar nossas próprias premissas. O que importa saber é como nosso sujeito/ex-objeto percebe nossas categorias/conceitos criadas para descrevê-lo. Para Viveiros de Castro, o deslocamento reflexivo deve ocorrer considerado-se uma equivocidade intencional. Portanto, devemos refletir sobre as consequências que nossas escolhas ontoepistemológicas terão sobre nossa pesquisa a partir do ponto de vista do Outro. Os conceitos de deslocamento reflexivo e equivocidade intencional têm muito a contribuir com a construção do Outro em EOR e com o conceito de border thinking nos estudos decolonais.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE | *Perspectivismo ameríndio, antropofagia, border thinking, equivocidade intencional, deslocamento reflexivo.*

SERGIO EDUARDO DE PINHO VELHO WANDERLEY[1]
sergiow.gaz@terra.com.br
ORCID: 0000-0002-9248-5214

ANA PAULA MEDEIROS BAUER[1]
anabauer@id.uff.br
ORCID: 0000-0002-0901-6098

[1]Unigranrio, Programa de Pós-Graduacao em Administração, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

RESUMEN

Este ensayo analiza las posibilidades que el concepto de perspectivismo amerindio de Viveiros de Castro ofrece a los Estudios Organizacionales. El Manifiesto Antropófago de Oswald de Andrdade es el hilo conductor de nuestra investigación. El perspectivismo amerindio sugiere un desplazamiento reflexivo a la posición ocupada por el objeto de la investigación, que se convierte así en el sujeto a partir del cual debemos cuestionar nuestras propias premisas. Lo que importa es saber cómo nuestro sujeto/objeto anterior percibe nuestras categorías/conceptos creados para describirlo. Para Viveiros de Castro, el desplazamiento reflexivo debe ocurrir considerando una equivocidad intencional. Por lo tanto, debemos reflexionar sobre las consecuencias que nuestras elecciones onto-epistemológicas tendrán en nuestra investigación desde el punto de vista del otro. Los conceptos de desplazamiento reflexivo y equivocidad intencional tienen mucho que aportar a la construcción del otro en EO y al concepto de pensamiento fronterizo en los estudios decoloniales.

PALABRAS CLAVE | *Perspectivismo amerindio, antropofagia, border thinking, equivocidad*

INTRODUCTION

"Tupi, or not Tupi that is the question" is one of the most well-known and cited aphorisms from the "Anthropophagous Manifesto" that was published in May 1928 by Oswald de Andrade in the first issue of the *Anthropophagy Review*. The Manifesto is illustrated by the painting *Abaporu* —the term means "man who eats man" in Tupi—that was gifted to Oswald by his companion, Tarsila do Amaral. The painting expresses the anthropophagic process that Oswald describes in the text; the following year, Tarsila would create the painting *Antropofagia*. In this aphorism, Oswald devours the Hamletian dilemma and, without using a Portuguese word, represents, through the binomial Tupi/To be, "one of the central tensions that will be explored throughout the text of the Manifesto" in which he promotes a subversion of the "Brazil/world relationship, or primitive tribe/Western culture" (Azevedo, 2016, p. 109).

A similar subversion is proposed by the Brazilian "Americanist ethnologist" Viveiros de Castro (2015, p. 155) while introducing his concept of Amerindian perspectivism. Viveiros de Castro (1986) developed this concept during his PhD research among the Araweté, the Tupi-speaking people from the Western Amazon region. Therefore, the origin of this concept is quite different from the concept of anthropophagy proposed by Oswald de Andrade by drawing inspiration from the modernist movement that grew out of the 1922 Art Week in São Paulo-Brazil. However, both anthropophagy and Amerindian perspectivism are based on "cannibal metaphysics" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, 2016).

For Viveiros de Castro (2016), Oswaldian anthropophagy is the most original metacultural reflexivity ever produced in Latin America; further, he suggests that Oswald de Andrade's "*Anthropophagous Manifesto*" is an *avant la lettre* decolonial proposal. Anthropophagy in social thought reveals itself as the reflexivity that seeks to identify what is best in the other, and absorbing that which makes us stronger. It does not reject what comes from outside; it seeks to identify what may be useful for the present reality, based on the location of the subject. It does, however, relegate what comes from the outside to a subordinate position (Azevedo, 2016).

The Amerindian perspectivism of Viveiros de Castro (2015) suggests a "reflexive displacement" (p. 72) to the position occupied by the object of investigation, which, thus, becomes the subject from which we must question our own premises. What matters is not how our categories understand/describe the object, and much less what part of us is reflected in the object, but how our subject/ex-object perceives the categories/concepts we created to describe it. Further, we must ask ourselves whether—from the point of view of our subject—the categories/concepts are, in fact, necessary. In other words,

it is necessary to seek an anthropological concept of concept that assumes the extrapositionality of all creative thinking ("wild") in its integral positivity, and that develops in a completely different direction from the traditional notions of category (innate or acquired), of representation (propositional or semi) or belief (simple or "folded", as they say of flowers) (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 75).

For Viveiros de Castro (2015), the reflexive displacement must occur using a "controlled equivocation" when we try to occupy the Other's point of view, since "to translate is to assume that there has always been a mistake; it is to communicate by difference, instead of silencing the other by assuming an original univocity and an ultimate redundancy—an essential similarity—between what he and we 'were saying'" (p. 91).

This essay discusses the possibilities offered by the concept of Amerindian perspectivism to Organizational Studies (OS). The *Anthropophagous Manifesto*, with its 51 aphorisms, as dissected by Azevedo (2016), will be the guiding thread of our theoretical essay—a trajectory that commenced with the choice of the title. The aphorisms of the manifesto will emerge throughout this essay as demarcators, or exclamations, and will be guide us in the process of anthrophagizing the main work of Viveiros de Castro (2015) investigated here: *Cannibal Metaphysics: Elements for a Post-structural Anthropology*. Thus, we have already started our essay with a reflexive displacement when we treat the manifesto literature as science, in contrast to the proposal of "treating science as literature" for the production of knowledge (Czarniawska, 2004, p. 103). The following questions will guide us in this essay. What onto-epistemological reflexive practices can we employ in OS based on the concept of Amerindian perspectivism? What should we consider in the construction of the other in OS based on a reflexive displacement that assumes a controlled equivocation?

OS has already appropriated contributions, such as Bruno Latour's actor-network theory—something on which Viveiros de Castro also relied—from the field of anthropology. Similarly, decolonial studies includes anthropologists, such as Arturo Escobar and Fernando Coronil, among their prominent researchers. Thus, another objective of this essay is to popularize—as a product of our anthropophagic process—the thought of Oswald de Andrade and Viveiros de Castro to expand the frontiers of decolonial studies in Latin America. Decolonial studies has endeavored to focus thinking, and shed light, on the Latin American reality. However, we note that the role of Brazil in

decolonial studies has not been properly explored. Some Brazilian thinkers, such as Paulo Freire, Darcy Ribeiro, and Milton Santos, are mentioned, but their theoretical constructions are not duly explored (Wanderley & Barros, 2019). Brazilian social thought has theoretical propositions that can strengthen decolonial studies (Maia, 2009). We believe that OS can drink from the source of social sciences to expand its epistemological paths without falling into the dangers of "epistemicide" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 104), thereby avoiding Euro-American thinking as the unique possibility. After all, "without us, Europe would not even have its poor declaration of human rights" (Andrade, 1928).

Moreover, as suggested by Oswald de Andrade, we seek to promote the "inversion of temporal and geographical hierarchies" (Azevedo, 2016, p. 155), and, thus, to rotate the geography of reasoning to escape the colonization of time-space imposed by the Euro-American modernity (Mignolo, 2011). Above all, we are committed to the task of "*penser autrement* (Foucault) thinking— thinking 'otherwise', thinking another mind, thinking with other minds" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 25).

After this section, we discuss the tradition and autonomy of critical OS in Brazil and current trends in the field, with an emphasis on the concept of anthropophagy. In the third section, we present the concepts that Viveiros de Castro elaborates from "cannibalistic metaphysics," discussing the possibilities of Amerindian perspectivism in OS and how these concepts can support decolonial studies. We close the essay with our final remarks.

"WE WERE NEVER CATECHIZED": CRITICAL ORGANIZATIONAL STUDIES IN BRAZIL

"We were never catechized" is one of the few phrases that Oswald de Andrade (1928) repeats in the manifesto. This phrase highlights the indigenous resistance to Portuguese colonization and, above all, the reaction to the Catholicism imposed by the Jesuits. More than resisting, the inversion process suggested by Oswald in the manifesto aims to emphasize that Brazil "is not" behind "in relation to Europe. There is no need to 'copy' anything or be guided by foreign laws, on the contrary, Brazil is a pioneer and original matrix of the future" (Azevedo, 2016, p. 196). In the same sense, this section aims to present the tradition and autonomy of critical organizational studies (COS) (Paes de Paula, 2010) in Brazil and some of its current trends.

Oswald de Andrade (1928) starts his manifesto by pointing out that "Only anthropophagy unites us. Socially. Economically. Philosophically." Thus, as pointed out by Azevedo (2016), he demonstrates a response to the communist manifesto, and he

intended to illustrate that, even before the communist ideal developed, anthropophagy was already practiced by the original peoples, thereby rescuing the ancestral ritual of the nation. The work is called a manifesto because the title is political and provocative, and that is the author's intention. Thus, Oswald continues unveiling and trying to demonstrate how life existed before the "discovery;" further, he states that there was no need for introducing a new movement to the world, life was already lived in it, a daily life unfolded in the lands of the original peoples (Azevedo, 2016).

The penultimate aphorism of the manifesto contains the sentences "our independence has not yet been proclaimed" and "It is necessary to expel the bragantino spirit," thereby referring critically to the official event of the proclamation of independence. These phrases highlight the cultural independence movement proposed by the Week of 22 during the centenary commemoration of the official proclamation of Brazilian independence (Azevedo, 2016). Thus, Oswald denounces the fact that it is still necessary to proclaim Brazil's liberation even 100 years after it occurred. In other words, epistemic coloniality (Ibarra-Colado, 2008) continues to this day, long after the end of colonial domination. This is one of the reasons why we can consider the *Anthropophagous Manifesto* to be a manifestation of the decolonial project long before the political project was launched by Latin American (Hispanic) researchers.

In the same sense, COS in Brazil predates the critical movement in the Anglo-Saxon world that became known as Critical Management Studies (CMS). Thinkers, such as Alberto Guerreiro Ramos, Maurício Tragtenberg, and Fernando Prestes Motta, produced studies possessing the characteristics of CMS, even before this aspect was formally inaugurated (Paes de Paula, 2010). It is argued that "the central idea is that this anticipation constitutes a tradition, which is autonomous because the theoretical and epistemological basis used by these critical thinkers is different" (Paes de Paula, 2015, p. 410). For example, Ramos (1954, p. 67) denounced "canned sociology," that is, the rancidness of Brazilian thought in carrying out mere transplants of experiences already lived in the contexts of more advanced countries. In turn, Oswald de Andrade (1928) proclaimed: "Against all importers of canned conscience."

The anthropophagy suggested by Oswald was already considered within OS and management studies. The pioneering study by Wood and Caldas (1998), titled "Organizational Anthropophagy," found that importing foreign models is problematic. Thus, it sought to discuss why this import occurs, and, then, to show that local peculiarities prevent the implementation of this import as planned; finally, it proposes and illustrates an "anthropophagic method" of action for this import by emerging

countries. This method, for importing management models, aims at an adaptive and reflexive approach based on a creative and appropriate commitment; it suggests that organizations from emerging countries do not import "foreign technology directly and thoughtlessly, but should, when it is essential to, use foreign models, to select without prejudice and in a creative way the best that such foreign references can offer" (Wood & Caldas, 1998, p. 17).

Anthropophagy was also explored in the study of Faria, Carvalho, and Collares (2001), who focused on the proposal for organizational anthropophagy and the need for a less "nationalistic" and scientific proposal to address issues of knowledge and culture. Then, based on the careful reconstruction of the original anthropophagic movement and its particular epistemology, the authors propose the creation, in Brazil, of a line called tribal studies.

Islam (2012) used anthropophagy as a metaphor for: understanding knowledge in organizations; approaching the concept of post-colonial thought; and contributing to a better understanding of the issues of mixture and hybridism essential to contemporary social theory. In his next article, Islam (2014) sought to make a theoretical contribution by introducing the concept of cultural anthropophagy in the literature on diversity. The author appropriated Kristeva's notion of abjection to understand cultural anthropophagy more clearly; further, he put forward the argument that cultural anthropophagy crosses borders and builds identity through desire and aggression toward those who are valued by them. Islam (2015) investigates corporality and the mixture of culture. The objective was to contribute to organizational thinking on cultural mixing by considering it as an embodied sensory process, and investigating the concept of organizational anthropophagy as a metaphor for a particular way of organizational understanding. It is worth mentioning that Islam (2012, 2014, 2015)'s writings used Viveiros de Castro, among other authors, to further understand anthropophagy.

Faria, Wanderley, Reis, and Celano (2013) used anthropophagy to present the lessons learned from a case study conducted at Galpão Aplauso (GA). The main objective of GA—an NGO based in Rio de Janeiro—is to (re) socialize low-income young people through a critical methodology informed by anthropophagy. The authors pointed out that appropriating this methodology reveals its capacity to contribute to the knowledge produced in GA that these young people possess. In addition, Faria et al. (2013) demonstrated that, through the critical methodology informed by anthropophagy, it is possible to go beyond the Eurocentric traditions, thus expanding the geographical and cultural references.

Pinto's work (2014) sought to develop a method for accelerating the transplantation of managerial technologies. This work was based on the sociological reduction of the Oswaldian poetics and is part of the anthropophagic movement for promoting creative strategic responses in the face of institutional pressures.

Prado and Sapsed (2016) focused on bringing anthropophagy to management studies through innovation. The authors highlight how project innovations can be successfully disseminated within a project-based organization and how these projects evolve through adaptation. To develop this work, Prado and Sapsed (2016) based it on the metaphorical notion of anthropophagy, using it to explain the appropriation of the resulting otherness in the ongoing life of the organization.

Thus, it is noted that the contributions of anthropophagy have already sparked debates in OS, management, and even strategy, innovation, corporeality, and diversity. In addition, we would like to highlight some of the current debates in OS that seek to expand the possibilities of understanding phenomena through other epistemologies and ontologies. To do so, we aggregate the discussions on intersectional theory and the Anthropocene.

The intersectional theory has its origins in the field of black feminism, where it seeks to propose theories that contribute to the deconstruction of inequality structures (Teixeira, Oliveira, & Mesquita, 2019). Intersectionality appropriates a metaphorical conceptualization of the intersection by understanding that the problem it seeks to capture comes from the "structural and dynamic consequences of the interaction between two or more axes of subordination" (Crenshaw, 2002, p. 177). Intersectionality deals specifically with how racism, patriarchy, class oppression, and other discriminatory processes result and generate basic inequalities that shape the relative positions of women, races, ethnicities, classes, and others (Crenshaw, 2002). Disempowerment is also an aspect addressed by intersectionality because "specific actions and policies generate oppressions that flow along such axes, constituting dynamic or active aspects of disempowerment" (Crenshaw, 2002, p. 177). It is possible to notice works that appropriate this theoretical contribution in the field of OS and discuss it in congresses (e.g. Teixeira et al., 2019).

Viveiros de Castro (2019) is currently dedicating himself to science studies by exploring the notion of the Anthropocene in dialogue with theorists, such as Bruno Latour (2014), Donna Haraway (2016), and Isabelle Stengers (2018). The Anthropocene can be understood as the present era during which human beings and societies have become a huge geophysical force on the planet; further, the great acceleration of development and the increase in the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere during this era has consequences relevant to the terrestrial system (Steffen, Crutzen, & McNeill, 2007). The discussions about the Anthropocene, as well as the

147 ISSN 0034-7590; eISSN 2178-938X

intersectional theory, have also been gaining ground in the area of OS (e.g., Figueiredo & Marquesan, 2019).

Latour (2014), in his discussion of the Anthropocene, warns of the tension between science and politics based on the concepts used to determine this era; this is because there is no consensus on its existence if one relies on geological parameters. The author proposes that the concept of the Anthropocene must go beyond the geological dimensions and touch upon philosophy, anthropology, and politics. However, in view of the uncertainties and dissent in the scientific and political fields over this concept, it is important to highlight that the relevance of the Anthropocene is its appropriation as an option for the notion of modernity (Latour, 2014). Latour also understands that the Anthropocene makes clear the inseparability between nature and culture—the separation between these two elements was something pre-established by modernity and it is no longer supported in the current era (Latour, 2014).

In turn, Haraway (2016) pointed out that "the relevance of naming the Anthropocene, Plantationocene, or Capitalocene has to do with scale, rate/speed, synchronicity and complexity" (p. 139). The author questions whether there is an inflection point that changes "the name of the game of life on earth for everyone and everything," that is, something beyond climate change, and also including toxic chemicals, depletion of rivers and lakes, and genocides; all these factors may cause recursive collapses of the system (Haraway, 2016, p. 139).

Stengers (2018) introduces the cosmopolitical proposition into the Anthropocene discussion. Such a proposition is not intended to become theory or universal; thus, "the cosmopolitical proposition is even incapable of giving a 'good' definition of the procedures that allow the 'good' definition of a 'good' common world" to be achieved (Stengers, 2018, p. 446). The author emphasizes that "cosmos, as it appears in that cosmopolitical term, designates the unknown that constitutes these multiple, divergent worlds" (Stengers, 2018, p. 447). Stengers (2018) seeks to highlight the differences and inconsistencies, without worrying about proposing neutral solutions or standards that allow generalizations in the social world.

In his most recent work, Viveiros de Castro (2019) sought to draw the sketch of a notion of "ontological anarchism" as the appropriate method of existence for the Anthropocene; this is based on the understanding that Anthropocene thinking requires the practice of a radical form of ontological pluralism. We can say that this pluralism is present in the Amerindian worldview (Viveiros de Castro, 2015). Viveiros de Castro (2019) distinguishes between model and example as contrasting ways of articulating thought and action in the Anthropocene. The author considers the distinction to be useful in understanding the ontological assumptions of geoengineering as a technopolitical correction.

Latour (2014), Haraway (2016), and Stengers (2018) are not anthropophagic thinkers; however, their discussions around the Anthropocene and within science studies related to issues, such as post-humanism, nature and the body, are part of the worldview of several peoples from Latin America, including the Araweté surveyed by Viveiros de Castro (1986).

"IN THE MATRIARCHY OF PINDORAMA": VIVEIROS DE CASTRO AND THE CANNIBAL METAPHYSICS

"In the matriarchy of Pindorama" (referring to the name given to Brazil by the Amerindians) is a wildcard aphorism that Oswald de Andrade (1928) used to create an invented "space-time" and, thus, demarcate his own territory—timeless—by inverting the patriarchy inherited from the west (Azevedo 2016, p. 91). It was from his immersion in the Araweté space-time that Viveiros de Castro (1986) developed the concept of Amerindian perspectivism. Therefore, in order to preserve the originality of Viveiros de Castro's research, we retain, whenever possible, the original citations.

Eduardo Batalha Viveiros de Castro, who was born in Rio de Janeiro, holds a degree in social sciences from PUC-RJ (Catholic University) and is a professor of social anthropology at the National Museum of UFRJ (Viveiros de Castro, 2015). His seminal work, *The Cosmological Pronouns and the Amerindian Perspectivism* (1996), was translated into several languages and inspired anthropological reflexivity around the world. Roy Wagner (an influential American anthropologist) says that Viveiros de Castro's contributions made people like him acquire a critical perception of the work they were doing (Wagner, 2011). According to Wagner (2011), the introduction of this concept was a major contribution from Brazil to the world of anthropology.

In this section, we present the concept of Amerindian perspectivism and seek to understand its potential contribution to OS and decolonial studies. This section is divided into subsections to present the different concepts that Viveiros de Castro (2015) proposes to understand the worldview of the natives; these concepts—multinaturalism, reflexive displacement, controlled equivocation and shamanism—make up Amerindian perspectivism. Before that, however, the warnings of Viveiros de Castro (2015, p. 95 and 231) are appropriate: "[...] indigenous theories do not present themselves in such a practical way, dear reader [...] because we cannot think *like* the Indians; at most, we can think *with* the Indians".

"Against all Catecheses" (Andrade, 1928): Amerindian Perspectivism or Perspectivist Multinaturalism

To illustrate how perspectivism takes place, Viveiros de Castro (2015) reports his starting point as the Lévi-Strauss parable about the conquest of America. According to this parable, while the Spaniards created commissions in the Antilles to discuss whether the Indians possessed a soul, the Indias tried to submerge the bodies of the Spaniards for a long period to check whether their bodies also rotted. Viveiros de Castro's (2015) analysis of this parable points out the following:

> According to the perspectivist hypothesis, Amerindian ontological regimes diverge from those more widespread in the West, especially over what concerns the inverse semiotic functions attributed to the body and soul. For Spaniards from the West Indies incident, the marked dimension was the soul; for the Indians, it was the body. In other words, Europeans never doubted that the Indians had bodies (animals also have them); the Indians never doubted that Europeans had souls (animals have them too). Europeans ethnocentrism consisted of doubting that the bodies of others contained a soul similar to those inhabiting their own bodies; Amerindian ethnocentrism, on the contrary, consisted of doubting that other souls or spirits were endowed with a body materially similar to indigenous bodies. (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, pp. 36–37)

Lévi-Strauss' conclusion to this parable is that, in the face of mutual ignorance of the other, the Indians were more human in imagining that the Spaniards could be gods, whereas the Spaniards, in understanding that the Indians had no soul, considered them as animals. Being animals, they were liable to be hunted and domesticated (Viveiros de Castro, 2015). Moreover, by being decimated and despoiled, they allowed Europeans to practice the *ego conquiro*, without which the *ego cogito* would not have appeared (Dussel, 1993).

The parable of the Antilles helps us to understand the grounds on which the thought on Amerindian perspectivism begins; it demonstrates an ontological turn, and not only an epistemological one. It is necessary to understand how other beings understand their own nature, besides understanding how they understand us; this is required to, then, understand how their actions, rituals, beliefs and ways of life, and organization occur.

Amerindian perspectivism has, as its starting point, the Amazonian ethnographies and their countless references, which address an indigenous theory that deals with worldviews, where

> the way humans see animals and other subjectivities that populate the universe—gods, spirits, dead, inhabitants of other cosmic levels, meteorological phenomena, plants, sometimes even objects and artifacts—is profoundly different from the way these beings perceive them, see them and see themselves. (Viveiros de Castro, 1996, p. 117)

Therefore, it is necessary to disregard our point of view to capture how the Other's worldview and nature direct their actions. Amerindian perspectivism puts forward the notion that

> humans, under normal conditions, see humans as humans, animals as animals and spirits (if they see them) as spirits; whereas animals (predators) and spirits see humans as animals (of prey), whereas animals (of prey) see humans as spirits or as animals (predators). (Viveiros de Castro, 1996, p. 117)

However, from another point of view, animals and spirits "see themselves as human: they apprehend themselves as (or become) anthropomorphic when they are in their own houses or villages, and experience their own habits and characteristics under the species of culture" (Viveiros de Castro, 1996, p. 117). These beings also organize their mental map and perceive "their food as human food ([...] vultures see the worms of rotting meat as roasted fish), their bodily attributes as adornments or cultural instruments, their social system as organized in it like human institutions (with chiefs, shamans, parties, rites)" (Viveiros de Castro, 1996, p. 117). In short, "*the original condition common to humans and animals is not animality, but humanity*" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 60; italics in the original).

However, this "humanity is reflexive, but it cannot be mutual" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 62); this is because two "human" poles cannot be activated simultaneously and recognize themselves and the other as human. This is explained by the fact that

it is the human who vicariously occupies the position of cosmological subject; everything existing can be thought of as thinking ("it exists, therefore it thinks"), that is, as "activated" or "managed by a point of view"; in other words, a radical real or objective diversity. Perspectivism is a multinaturalism, because a perspective is not a representation. A perspective is not a representation because representations are properties of the spirit, but the point of view is in the body. (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 65)

Viveiros de Castro (2015, p. 69) presents the concept of "perspectivist multinaturalism" as being similar to Amerindian perspectivism; this is because "Amazonian multinaturalism does not affirm a variety of natures, but the naturalness of variation, variation as nature." Multinaturalism serves as a counterpoint to the Western concept of multiculturalism, as it starts from a "unity of nature and a multiplicity of cultures," whereas the Amerindian conception presupposes the opposite—nature or the object is the form of the particular; further, in this case, "culture or the subject would be the form of the universal" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 43).

In this intermingling of worlds, indigenous theory realizes that animals are also people, or are perceived as people because the point of view is in the body (Viveiros de Castro, 1996). This construction "is almost always associated with the idea that the manifest form of each species is a mere envelope ('clothing') to hide an internal human form, normally visible only to the eyes of the species itself or those of certain trans-specific beings, such as shamans" (Viveiros de Castro, 1996, p. 117). In this dialectic of the different worlds, the figure of the shaman becomes essential. Shamans are "dedicated to communicating and managing these crossed perspectives, they are always there to make concepts sensitive or intuitions intelligible" (Viveiros de Castro, 1996, p. 117).

The clothing is the way the body presents itself because the fundamental issue for perspectivism is that all beings—living or not, human or not—have the ontological potential to acquire human form. It is from this (dis)continuity between living humans or dead-non-human-nature, and in the different forms that they present themselves, that perspectivism emerges. Therefore, "'personitude' and 'perspective'—the ability to occupy a point of view—are a matter of degree, context, and position, rather than a distinctive property of this or that species" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 46). It is for this reason that Oswald de Andrade (1928) exclaimed that "what trampled

the truth was clothing, the impermeable between the inner and the outer world." What Oswald seems to propose to us here is "a greater interpenetration between these two worlds, reviving a natural dialog that was corrupted by the "clothes" that (re) clothe civilization" (Azevedo, 2016, pp. 117-118).

Moreover, being limited by our "clothes"—or by the "armor" of our theoretical and methodological premises—is what makes us perceive other ways of thinking and the nature of other beings as something distant and external to us; therefore, it causes our ancestry/locality to be rejected and, thus, can lead us to praise the vision of the North. In this way, "to suppose that all 'European' discourse about peoples of non-European tradition only serves to illuminate our 'representations of the Other' is to make of a certain theoretical post-colonialism the most perverse manifestation of ethnocentrism" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 21).

The author criticizes the way of working and researching in his field—Anthropology. For him, "it is necessary to address all the consequences of the idea that the societies and cultures that are the object of anthropological research influence, or, [...] co-produce the theories about society and culture formulated from this research" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 22). In this sense, to deny this question means to assume one-way constructivism, where the researcher perceives the other only as an object, and not a denial of impartiality. It is important not to subject the native to an "othering," which means "any anthropological characterization that does not make him a mirror in which we recognize ourselves" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 22).

What Viveiros de Castro (2015) proposes is that we do exactly the opposite, that is, we should take native thinking "as a *practice of meaning*: as a self-referential device for the production of concepts, of 'symbols that represent themselves'" (p. 229; italics in the original). Therefore, perspectivism "is not a type, but a concept; in fact, it is not a type of type, but a concept of a concept, the most interesting use of which is not so much to classify cosmologies that seem excessively exotic, but to counter-analyze anthropologies that are all too familiar" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 73).

As in the *Anthropophagous Manifesto*, "everything passes through the body and to the body it will return; (Azevedo, 2016, p. 205), this is because "perspectivism is a corporal mannerism" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 66). Perspectivism presupposes a unity of spirit and diversity of bodies and "it is the body as a bundle of affections and capabilities, and that is the origin of the perspectives" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 66). In the words of Oswald de Andrade (1928), "the spirit refuses to receive the spirit without the body.." So, if animals, or the dead, see themselves

as human and, in this way, are able to see objects in the same way as we see different objects, we have the representation of a single sense, but based on multiple references: "all beings see ('represent') the world in *the same way*—what changes is *the world they see*" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 64; italics in the original). Therefore, "perspectivism presupposes a constant epistemology and variable ontologies," and its quest is not "to find the common reference, but, on the contrary, to find the mistake" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 67).

"Against the Reversible World and the Objective, Cadaverized Ideas": Reflexive Displacement/Controlled Equivocation

To "find the mistake," it is necessary, for the understanding/occupation based on the point of view of the Other, that we carry out a reflexive displacement based on a controlled equivocation (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 67). This is another way for OS to go beyond "objective, cadaverized ideas" (Andrade, 1928).

In his coexistence with the Araweté, Viveiros de Castro (1986) suggests that one of his inspirations for formulating the concept of Amerindian perspectivism was the singing during the cannibal ritual of the warrior who will make the sacrifice of the enemy captured in combat. It is important to note that the Araweté do not devour their victims, who are offered as a sacrifice to "supernatural entities [who were] in the role of the active pole of the cannibal relationship" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 158). The warrior sings in the voice of his enemy and tells, from the point of view of his enemy, how he sees the warrior himself and how many of the Araweté he, the enemy, would have exterminated. What is devoured is not the body, but what it symbolizes—the enemy's relationship with its devourer. In other words, "what was assimilated from the victim was the signs of his otherness, and what was aimed at was that otherness as a point of view on the self" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 160).

Mainly, we realize that the cannibal ritual of the Araweté represents "a paradoxical movement of reciprocal self-determination from the point of view of the enemy" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 160); thus, on the basis of a reflexive displacement, the warrior, from the point of view of the enemy, apprehends himself as a subject, "or rather, in which he pronounces his own uniqueness through the voice of the other. Perspectivism" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 161).

Viveiros de Castro (2015, p. 159) ended up defining Tupi cannibalism as an "actantial scheme" and "a process of transmutation of perspectives, where the 'I' is determined

as 'other' by the very act of incorporating this other, which in turn becomes an 'I', but always *in* the other, *through* the other ('through' also in the solecistic sense of 'across the body')".

The reflexive displacement is performed with the intention of "settling in the space of the mistake and inhabiting it. Not to undo it, which would suppose that it never existed, but quite the contrary, to enhance it, opening and expanding the space that was thought not to exist between conceptual languages" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 90). Further, equivocation takes, as its premises, that the languages at stake are heterogeneous and that there is a blank space between them: "equivocation, in short, is not a subjective failure, but a device of objectification. It is not a mistake or an illusion [...]" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 90).

"Low Anthropophagy… it is Against it that we are Acting. Anthropophagi (Andrade, 1928): Shaman a Border Thinker?

We are here in our sterile research environment trying to practice high anthropophagy. We were not with Oswald de Andrade at the 1922 Art Week; we did not write for the Anthropophagy Review; and we did not live for some years—as Viveiros de Castro did—with the Araweté. We did not even visit an indigenous tribe to write this essay. The most we can do is think *with* them—Oswald and Viveiros de Castro—since "we cannot think *like*" them (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 231). After all, "what do we [in OS] have to do with it?" (Andrade, 1928).

Above all, the concept of Amerindian perspectivism leads us, as researchers, to become reflexive about the theoretical and methodological choices we make to investigate our object/subject. We should practice reflexivity not only from our own perspective, but also from the point of view of our subject/ex-object. After all, "every experience of another thought is an experience of our own" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 96). We must be reflexive on the consequences of our task as researchers when we master a theoretical-methodological structure—our clothes—and go around the world looking for objects/subjects in which we can—dress—apply this structure-clothes. In Amerindian perspectivism, "an object is an incompletely interpreted subject" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 52).

Therefore, in order to interpret this subject, we must be reflexive on the consequences that our onto-epistemological choices will have on our research from the point of view of the Other. At this point, we understand that the concepts of reflexive displacement and controlled equivocation (Viveiros de Castro, 2015) have a lot to contribute to the construction of the Other in

OS and to the concept of border thinking in decolonial studies. The border thinker seeks to produce knowledge that is different from the knowledge to which it relates, without being a mere reproducer; rather, he or she seeks to be an agent that transits between borders without identifying with any of them (Faria, 2013), that is, it moves on both sides and traditions without belonging to any (Mignolo & Tlostanova, 2006). After all, "the object of interpretation is the object's counter-interpretation" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 52).

In this ontological turn of perspective, the researcher would be a shaman outside the border when dialoguing with the knowledge produced on the inside. Viveiros de Castro (2015) points out that "shamanism is a way of acting that implies a way of knowing, or rather, a certain ideal of knowledge" (p. 50). We realize that this function of the shaman comes close to a border thinking attitude because "Amerindian shamanism can be defined as the ability of certain individuals to deliberately cross body barriers between species and adopt the perspective of 'foreign' subjectivities, in order to manage the relationships between these and humans" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 49). Further, managing these relationships does not mean finding synonyms among similar representations for different objects that each species makes, but "it is not to lose sight of the hidden difference within the equivocal *homonyms* that connect and separate our language and that of other species" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 68; italics in the original).

In this sense, it is important to emphasize that this perspective is the result of another way of thinking that moves away from the objectivist logic that is motivated by the modernity of the West. For such a modernity, "to know is to 'objectify'; it is to be able to distinguish in the object what is intrinsic to that which belongs to the knowing subject, and which, as such, was improperly and/or inevitably projected onto the object" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 50). Modern epistemology understands that to know "is to de-subject, to make explicit the part of the subject present in the object, in order to reduce it to an ideal minimum (or to enlarge it demonstrably in order to obtain spectacular critical effects)" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 50).

In this way, everything becomes an object for Western modernity and is liable to be objectified; thus, it is necessary to rationalize and shape what is intended to be known:

> The subjects, as well as the objects, are granted as the result of objectification processes: the subject is constituted or recognizes himself in the objects he produces, and he knows himself

objectively when he can see himself "from the outside", as an "it" [...] what was not objectified remains unreal and abstract, the form of the Other is a thing. (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 50)

Border thinking brings different actors from the field to the surface; these actors develop theories and ideas of knowledge; seeking to shed light on everyone; shifting the exclusive legitimacy of articulating concepts and theories from European modernity; seeking to empower those who were "unemployed by the ego and the politics of knowledge" (Mignolo & Tlostanova, 2006, p. 207). Border thinking comprises the existence and coexistence of all worlds and aims at "building a world in which many worlds and knowledge can coexist" (Faria, 2013, p. 278). Therefore,

> The decolonial epistemic shift is no longer grounded in Greek and Latin categories of thought that informed modern epistemology (since the Renaissance) in the six European imperial languages (Italian, Spanish and Portuguese for the Renaissance; French, English and German for the Enlightenment), but in the epistemic borders between European imperial categories and languages and categories that modern epistemology ruled out as epistemically non-sustainable (e.g., Mandarin, Japanese, Russian, Hindi, Urdu, Aymara, Nahuatl, Wolof, Arabic, etc.) (Mignolo & Tlostanova, 2006, p. 207)

We must add to this list not only the languages of the peoples of Latin America, but also, and above all, the worldview they developed based on these languages, such as the Tupi of the Araweté studied by Viveiros de Castro. It is important to note that Viveiros de Castro (2015) suggests that some of the elements of the Araweté worldviews are common to several peoples in Latin America.

Whether as a shaman or a border thinker, what matters to us, as researchers, is that we must be aware that "to know is to 'personify', to take the point of view of what should be known. Or rather, that who; because the question is to know '*the who* of things' (Guimarães Rosa), indispensable knowledge to answer with intelligence the question of 'why'. The other's form is the person" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 50; italics in the original). Further, to take the form of the other, or to inhabit his or her body so that we can activate his or her point of view, we must be aware that equivocity is a premise. The epistemological proposal

introduced by Amerindian perspectivism is based on the principle that "true knowledge aims to reveal a maximum of intentionality, through a systematic and deliberate 'agency abduction' process" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 51).

What we are suggesting here is that we "want the Caraíba revolution" (Andrade, 1928), that is, we want to "decatechize" thought, the "canned conscience", just as Oswald operates "through the ruptures he introduces in his own language and in the chain of aphorisms in the Manifesto, where there is no predictable sequence or 'domesticated' syntax" (Azevedo, 2016, p. 141). What we aim for is "the undated world. Not initialed. Without Napoleon. Without César" (Andrade, 1928). This is achieved through the inversion of the temporal and geographical hierarchies that dominate the construction of knowledge (Mignolo, 2011). In short, "it is a question of reading philosophers in the light of wild thought, and not the other way around: it is a question of updating the countless becoming-others that exist as virtualities of our thinking;" this is because "now it is the native's turn - *the turn of the native* " (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 88 and 90).

"AGAINST THE INDIAN TORCH BEARER"

The objective of this essay was to investigate the possibilities of the concept of Amerindian perspectivism in OS. Keeping in mind the content of *Anthropophagous Manifesto* (Andrade, 1928), we devoured the book by Viveiros de Castro (2015) and, as a consequence, presented the concepts of anthropophagy and Amerindian perspectivism to expand the space for debates in OS and decolonial studies. By bringing indigenous worldviews closer together, we can broaden the perspectives used in this field, thereby understanding perspectivism as a way of breaking onto-epistemological barriers. However, as Andrade (1928) warns, we are "against the Indian torch bearer" and against the "Indian dressed as a Senator of the Empire," which symbolize the "images of Brazilian romantic Indianism and its uncritical transfer of values" (Azevedo, 2016, p. 170).

In no way do we intend to exhaust, in this essay, the possibilities of using concepts from Amerindian perspectivism in OS; on the contrary, we want to encourage other researchers to explore all possible developments. We understand the potential of perspectivism, just as Azevedo (2016) understands Oswald de Andrade's *Anthropophagous Manifesto*: "it is not a closed work, on the contrary, *it is a space full of possibilities and virtualities, it can and must be reread and recreated infinitely*" (pp. 213–214; italics in the original).

In an attempt to decolonize the theories that dominate OS, we believe that returning to the thoughts of the original peoples can provoke reflexivity about our locus of enunciation by taking into account that these perspectives can help us to trace a history of organizational knowledge, even as we try not to reproduce the mental maps and conceptual concepts. Thus, we believe that both Amerindian perspectives and anthropophagy can support the guidelines for (re) telling the possible stories of organizational knowledge based on the Latin American decolonial commitment; this can promote an ontological turn in which the researcher would be a shaman on the external side of the border when dialoguing with the knowledge produced on the internal side of the border.

Like a shaman who wears the Other's "clothes" to transit through other worlds, we need to make our clothes a harness for the encounter with the dominant thought on the inside of the border, just as we must undress our theoretical-methodological armor when we seek to (re) build the Other in OS. During this transition or reflexive displacement, we must assume a "border thinking" attitude that is based on an exercise of double consciousness (Mignolo, 2011); after all, "the sign of a first-rate shamanic intelligence is the ability to see simultaneously from two incompatible perspectives" (Viveiros de Castro, 2015, p. 63). In this reflexive displacement, we must assume a controlled equivocation so that we can seek from the inner side of the border that which strengthens us—anthropophagically—without allowing ourselves to be catechized and return to the outer side of the border. Thus, we can enable ourselves with the clothes provided by Amerindian perspectivism to investigate theories that seem too familiar, instead of using them to investigate objects that seem exotic to us.

We believe that Amerindian perspectivism for us, the researchers in the field of OS, comes close to a research attitude that exalts equivocation, that is, equality between voices. We also highlight, as a contribution of perspectivism, the importance of: entering the research field with the understanding that all voices have the same value, and understanding that it is in the nature of the field to have differences and not repetitions; further, our contribution is to highlight the differences that emerge between our understanding of the field and how the field perceives what we think we understand. It is from this heterogeneity that we must commence our investigation.

Following Oswald de Andrade's *Anthropophagous Manifesto*, we must fight to inscribe our diverse indigenous origins on the house of knowledge, and thus "expel the bragantine spirit" and break away from the epistemic coloniality; we need to fight "...against memory as a source of habits. The renewed personal experience."

REFERENCES

Andrade, O. de. (1928, maio). O manifesto antropófago. *Revista de Antropofagia*, *1, p. 3*.

Azevedo, B. (2016) *Antropofagia: Palimpsesto selvagem*. São Paulo, SP: Cosac Naify.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. (2002). Documento para o encontro de especialistas em aspectos da discriminação racial relativos ao gênero. *Revista Estudos Feministas*, 10(1), 171-188. doi: 10.1590/s0104-026x2002000100011

Czarniawska, B. (2004). *Narratives in social science research*. London, UK: Sage.

Dussel, E. (1993). 1492. *O encobrimento do outro: A origem do mito da modernidade*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.

Faria, A. (2013). Border thinking in action: Should critical management studies get anything done? In V. Malin, J. Murphy, & M. Siltaoja (Eds.), *Dialogues in critical management studies* (Vol. 2, pp. 277-308). London: Emerald.

Faria, A., Carvalho, J. L. F. S., & Collares, L. (2001, setembro). *Antropofagia, antropofagia organizacional e estudos tribais: Em busca da conciliação dialética de arte, cultura e management no Brasil*. XXV Encontro da ANPAD, Campinas, SP.

Faria, A., Wanderley, S., Reis, Y., & Celano, A. (2013). Can the subaltern teach? Performativity otherwise through anthropophagy?. In V. Malin, J. Murphy, & M. Siltaoja (Eds.), *Dialogues in critical management studies* (Vol. 2, pp. 205-224).

Figueiredo, M., & Marquesan, F. (2019, maio). *O Antropoceno como projeto científico para a América Latina: Possibilidades a partir dos estudos organizacionais*. X Encontro de Estudos Organizacionais da ANPAD, Fortaleza, CE.

Haraway, D (2016). Antropoceno, Capitaloceno, Plantationoceno, Chthuluceno: fazendo parentes. ClimaCom, ano 3, n. 5. Recuperado de climacom.mudancasclimaticas.net.br/?p=5258

Ibarra-Colado, E. (2008). Is there any future for critical management studies in Latin America? Moving from epistemic coloniality to 'trans-discipline'. *Organization*, *15*(6), 932-935. doi: 10.1177/1350508408095822

Islam, G. (2012). Can the subaltern eat? Anthropophagic culture as a Brazilian lens on post-colonial theory. *Organization*, *19*(2), 159-180. doi: 10.1177/1350508411429396

Islam, G. (2014). Appropriating the abject: An anthropophagic approach to organizational diversity. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *33*(7), 595-613. doi: 10.1108/edi-03-2012-0023

Islam, G. (2015). A taste for otherness: Anthropophagy and the embodied self in organizations. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *31*, 351-361. doi: 10.1016/j.scaman.2015.04.001

Latour, B. (2014). Para distinguir amigos e inimigos no tempo do Antropoceno. *Revista de Antropologia*, *57*(1), 11-31. doi: 10.11606/2179-0892.ra.2014.87702

Maia, J. (2009). Pensamento brasileiro e teoria social: Notas para uma agenda de pesquisa. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, *24*(71), 155-168. doi: 10.1590/S0102-69092009000300011

Mignolo, W. (2011). The darker side of Western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options. London, UK: Duke University Press.

Mignolo, W., & Tlostanova, M. (2006). Theorizing from the borders: Shifting to geo-and body-politics of knowledge. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *9*(2), 205-221. doi: 10.1177/1368431006063333

Paula, A. P. de. (2010). A tradição e a autonomia dos estudos organizacionais críticos no Brasil. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, *50*(1), 10-23. doi: 10.1590/s0034-75902010000100002

Paes de Paula, A. P. de. (2015). *Repensando os estudos organizacionais: Por uma Nova Teoria do Conhecimento*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: EdFGV, Fapemig.

Pinto, F. R. (2014, setembro). *A Redução Antropofágica: A poética de O. Andrade como método para transplantação acelerativa de tecnologias gerenciais*. XXXVIII Encontro da Anpad, Rio de Janeiro, RJ.

Prado, P., & Sapsed, J. (2016). The Anthropophagic organization: How innovations transcend the temporary in a project-based organization. *Organization Studies*, *37*(12), 1793-1818. doi: 10.1177/0170840616655491

Ramos, A. G. (1954). *Cartilha brasileira do aprendiz de sociólogo*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Andes.

Steffen, W., Crutzen, P. J., & McNeill, J. R. (2007). The Anthropocene: Are humans now overwhelming the great forces of nature. *AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment*, *36*(8), 614-621. doi:10.1579/0044-7447(2007)36[614:taahno]2.0.co;2

Stengers, I. (2018) A proposição cosmopolítica. *Revista do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros*, (69), 442-464.

Teixeira, J. C., Oliveira, J. S., & Mesquita, J. S. (2019, maio). *Pode a interseccionalidade ser afrocentrada no campo da administração? Um ensaio teórico sobre as contribuições da teoria interseccional para a área de administração*. X Encontro de Estudos Organizacionais da ANPAD, Fortaleza, CE.

Viveiros de Castro, E. B. (1986). *Araweté: Os deuses canibais*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: J. J. Zahar.

Viveiros de Castro, E. V. (1996). Os pronomes cosmológicos e o perspectivismo ameríndio. *MANA*, *2*(2), 115-144. doi: 10.1590/S0104-93131996000200005

Viveiros de Castro, E. V. (2015). *Metafísicas canibais: Elementos para uma antropologia pós-estrutural*. São Paulo, SP: Cosac Naify.

Viveiros de Castro, E. V. (2016). Prefácio. In B. Azevedo, *Antropofagia: Palimpsesto selvagem*. São Paulo, SP: Cosac Naify.

Viveiros de Castro, E., B. (2019). On models and examples: engineers and bricoleurs in the Anthropocene. *Current Anthropology,* 60, p. S296-S308. doi: 10.1086/70278

Wagner, R. (2011, agosto 17). *O Apache era o meu reverso*. Entrevista com Roy Wagner, realizada por Florencia Ferrari, Iracema Dulley, Jamille Pinheiro, Luísa Valentini, Renato Sztutman e Stelio Marras em São Paulo, SP.

Wanderley, S., & Barros, A. (2019). Decoloniality, geopolitics of knowledge and historic turn: Towards a Latin American agenda. *Management & Organizational History, 14*(1), 79-97. doi: 10.1080/17449359.2018.1431551

Wood, T., Jr., & Caldas, M, P. (1998). Antropofagia organizacional. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, *38*(4), 6-17. doi: 10.1590/s0034-75901998000400002

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

The work was thought and reflected together from the knowledge of the work of Viveiros de Castro, the search to know more and bring the Amerindian perspectivism of the EOR closer together led us to develop this work. The authors participated in all stages of development of the manuscript from conceptualization and theoretical-methodological approach, theoretical revision (literature survey), to the writing and final revision of the text.