

Provocations

Political Administration: Contributions to the Theoretical-Analytical and Empirical Debate of Contemporary Administration



Administração Política: Contribuições para o Debate Teórico-Analítico e Empírico da Administração Contemporânea

Elizabeth Matos Ribeiro¹
Mônica Matos Ribeiro^{*2}
Francisco César Pinto da Fonseca³

ABSTRACT

Objective: this paper aims to examine the contributions of Reginaldo Souza Santos' thought to the advancement of Contemporary Administration theory and practice. In doing so, it will consider the evolution of the theory of political administration from its conception to its present form. **Thesis:** the theory of Political Administration makes relevant contributions to the theory and practices of Contemporary Administration by recovering the possibilities, challenges and limits of Administration science in its subjective and objective aspects — political and technical — which underpin the purpose (intentionality), conception, movement and social purpose of this field of knowledge. **Conclusions:** (a) efforts undertaken by Reginaldo Santos, as expressed in the theory of Political Administration, contributed to the dialogue and renovation of the thinking of renowned Brazilian and Bahian thinkers, such as Guerreiro Ramos (1940-1982) and João Ubaldo Ribeiro (1968-2014). These thinkers were instrumental in inaugurating a critical debate about the (Social) Sciences of Administration and Organizational Studies; (b) innovations introduced by the theory of Political Administration allow for contending that the Brazilian academic demonstrates an important capacity for renewing the theoretical-critical debate on administrative (social) thought, particularly when defending the inseparability between theoretical-abstract aspects (from strategic management, or gestão) and administrative practices (from operational management, or gerência). In this sense, the theory of Political Administration has enabled production and dissemination of critical technologies and studies in management (public, private and social) committed to putting socially produced administrative-social knowledge and practices in service of promoting social welfare.

Keywords: political administration; administration epistemologies; administrative theory and practices; contemporary administration; Reginaldo Souza Santos.

*Corresponding Author.

1. Universidade Federal da Bahia, Escola de Administração, Salvador, BA, Brazil.
2. Universidade do Estado da Bahia, Departamento de Ciências Humanas, Santo Antônio de Jesus, BA, Brazil.
3. Fundação Getúlio Vargas, Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

Cite as: Ribeiro, E. M., Ribeiro, M. M., & Fonseca, F. C. P. (2024). Political administration: Contributions to the theoretical-analytical and empirical debate of contemporary administration. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 28(5), e240087. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2024240087.en>

of invited reviewers until the decision:

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 st round | | | | | | | | | | |

RESUMO

Objetivo: reconhecer e discutir as contribuições do pensamento de Reginaldo Souza Santos para os avanços das teorias e práticas da administração contemporânea, considerando a concepção e a evolução da teoria da administração política. **Tese:** a teoria de administração política apresenta relevantes contribuições para a teoria e as práticas da administração contemporânea ao resgatar as possibilidades, desafios e limites da ciência da Administração nos seus aspectos subjetivos e objetivos — políticos e técnicos — que fundamentam o propósito (intencionalidade), a concepção, o movimento e a finalidade social desse campo do conhecimento. **Conclusões:** (a) os esforços empreendidos por Reginaldo Santos, expressos na teoria da administração política, contribuíram para o diálogo e a atualização do pensamento de renomados pensadores brasileiros e baianos, como Guerreiro Ramos (1940-1982) e João Ubaldo Ribeiro (1968-2014), responsáveis pela inauguração do debate crítico acerca das ciências (sociais) da administração e dos estudos organizacionais; (b) as inovações introduzidas pela teoria da administração política possibilitam sustentar que a acadêmica brasileira revela importante capacidade de renovação do debate teórico-crítico sobre o pensamento (social) administrativo, especialmente ao defender a indissociabilidade entre os aspectos teórico-abstratos (próprios da gestão) e as práticas administrativas (próprias da gerência). Nesse sentido, a teoria da administração política tem possibilitado a produção e difusão de estudos e tecnologias críticas em gestão (pública e social) comprometidas em colocar os saberes e práticas administrativo-sociais produzidos socialmente a serviço da promoção do bem-estar social.

Palavras-chave: administração política; epistemologias da administração; teoria e práticas administrativas; administração contemporânea; Reginaldo Souza Santos.

JEL Code: B5.

Editors-in-chief: Marcelo de Souza Bispo (Universidade Federal do Paraíba, PPGA, Brazil)
Paula Chimentí (Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, COPPEAD, Brazil)

Guest Editors: Alessandra de Sá de Mello da Costa (Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)
Ariston Azevedo (Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil)

Francis Kanashiro Meneghetti (Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná, Brazil)

Reviewers: The reviewers did not authorize the disclosure of their identity.

Peer Review Report: The disclosure of the Peer Reviewers Report was not authorized by its reviewer.

Received: April 14, 2024

Last version received: August 06, 2024

Accepted: September 27, 2024

Published: October 28, 2024

INTRODUCTION

This essay aims to identify and examine the contributions of Reginaldo Souza Santos¹ to the debate on the theories and practices of contemporary administration. The genesis and evolution of the onto-epistemological and theoretical foundations of political administration are examined, with particular attention to this novel field contributes to understanding the management of “social relations of production, consumption, and distribution” (RSPC&D) in contemporary society. To that end, the text sought to answer two fundamental questions: What ensures that the contributions of this new field of knowledge are relevant to expanding contemporary administration studies? And how have these contributions become relevant for analyzing (social) administrative theories and practices?

To answer these questions, the authors emphasized establishing a productive and thought-provoking dialogue with the original concepts put forth by this thinker, to understand how he defines the objectives, functions, objects, and methods that characterize the science of administration. The social thought developed by Reginaldo Santos is framed within the broader context of critical principles articulated by various prominent Brazilian social thinkers². These thinkers, including Bertero et al. (1999, p. 148) critique traditional theories as being “peripheral, epistemologically flawed, and methodologically deficient, lacking originality ... [engaging in] large-scale uninformed mimicry.” Thus, this essay aimed to reflect on the originality of Santos’ thinking by analyzing his ideas alongside the relevant contributions of other eminent intellectuals, both nationally and internationally, who have criticized the limitations of traditional theories in the field.

This argument rests on the observation that Santos views the science of political administration as being in direct conflict with classical political economy, stating that this field has appropriated the object of knowledge proper to administration: namely, the management of RSPC&D. The author demonstrates that the social role of the science of political administration emerges in tandem with the philosophical and scientific movements of economic science — the heir to the modern Enlightenment movement. He bases his argument on historic-social evidence that became clearer during the course of his doctoral research, where he had the opportunity to deepen his studies into the central role played by classical public finance theories, as the scientific and technical basis for guaranteeing the design, organization, dynamics, and performance of the emerging industrial capitalist economy. The recognition of the significant role of public finance (which places the state at the center of managing the new RSPC&D pattern) positions this intellectual prominently in discussions on

the social and political role that the field of administration assumes in tackling contemporary social challenges.

Another important aspect identified in the analysis of Santos’ pioneering contributions to this new field of knowledge is the author’s distinctive perspective on the role of the humanities and social sciences in administrative and organizational studies. The author warns that although psychology, sociology, anthropology, and political science, among other disciplines, share the same objectives, functions, objects, and methods regarding social phenomena (with their respective particularities), when it comes to studying the management, organization, and execution of social phenomena, it falls upon the science of administration to assume this role.

It is important to highlight that the social context and the onto-epistemological and theoretical-methodological foundations that ground Santos’ social thinking — interpreted through the lens of administrative phenomena — constitute a valuable contribution and an invitation to expand the ongoing discussions on the onto-epistemological foundations and scientific practices that have shaped contemporary administrative and organizational studies (Faria, 2022; Mattos, 2009). In this regard, it should be emphasized that Santos’ work is situated within two main dimensions: the ontological/theoretical-critical and the empirical. Although this article focuses on the role of paradigmatic tension (as asserted by the classic studies of Khun, 1970), it should be noted that his studies have not only sought to engage with social life but have also prompted researchers to analyze contemporary empirical phenomena in a range of administrative fields, employing political administration as a theoretical methodological framework. In fact, contemporary society has witnessed, from a global perspective, the consolidation of significant changes in the management of organizations (public, private, and societal).

In public administration, phenomena such as the privatization of public companies, equipment concessions, and the contracting of management (which implies another form of concession) for public infrastructure through ‘management contracts,’ among other legal forms, have transformed the public arena. Ultimately, social and cultural public policies, along with public-private partnerships, and other growing strategies to introduce ‘managerial’ elements from the private sector into public administration, management, and policies, have privatized the meaning of ‘public.’ This increasingly reflects the emergence of ‘corporate governments’ (Dardot & Laval, 2016).

In private administration, the logic of the ‘lean company,’ which maximizes profits and aggressively reduces all costs, starting with labor, has become a paradigm of ‘efficiency,’ with social effects described by the

term ‘uberization,’ which drastically affects both workers and the environment: planned obsolescence to the point of paroxysm, depletion of increasingly less renewable natural resources, among countless others. Regarding the relationship with consumers, the precariousness of services provided is reflected in the oligopolization of contemporary anti-competitive capitalism, which contrasts with the ideological discourse of ‘competitive efficiency’ and the reduction of the worker to the only competitive element. In other words, the discourse of competition (hyper-neoliberal capitalism) targets workers, contrasting with the practices of joint ventures, cross-ownership, mergers, and the formation of large anti-competitive conglomerates across various economic sectors.

Also in public management, operational management practices (*gerenciais*) derived from new public management privatize the state by shaping it according to the concept of private ‘governance’ and through management tools, metrics, and instruments for both core and end activities (public policies). Regarding the concept of strategic management (*gestão*), its predominance on an individualistic, ‘meritocratic’ basis (a merit system devoid of social context, worsening historical social injustices), focuses entirely on profit and neglects any responsibility the company has towards the community, workers, and the environment, reflecting the so-called ‘Market God’ and ‘profit over life.’

In the management of macro-level social relations of production, consumption, and distribution within the capitalist system, led by the state and dominated by market interests, numerous studies have empirically revealed harmful consequences, showing a steep rise in asymmetries in growth and development levels among nations. This is further evidenced by the low growth rates of gross domestic product (GDP) in both developed and developing economies, along with a strong trend toward increasing disparities in the concentration and centralization of socially produced income and wealth (Chancel et al., 2022, Dowbor, 2017; World Bank, 2024).

These are just a few examples of contemporary topics and issues to which political administration contributes critical understanding, both from a theoretical perspective — by drawing connections with political economy, political science, and political philosophy — and from a practical dimension, as the examples above are embedded in management practices that reflect, though not without contradictions and resistance, the structural base of hegemonic neoliberal capitalism. These aspects will be addressed again at the conclusion of the text.

This article is structured into four sections, including this introduction. The second section presents the intellectual trajectory of Reginaldo Santos, followed by an analysis of the key seminal works that established the concept of

political administration. The third section reflects on the developments and impacts of these studies, emphasizing knowledge production and researcher training, while also highlighting the creation of scientific events and the formation of research networks. The final section offers brief concluding remarks that reinforce Santos’ contributions to contemporary administration and suggests future research agendas.

ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION OF REGINALDO SANTOS’ INTELLECTUAL PRODUCTION: ONTO EPISTEMOLOGICAL AND THEORETICAL BASES OF POLITICAL ADMINISTRATION

Born in Ubaitaba, a town in the interior of the Brazilian state of Bahia, Reginaldo Santos was introduced to the hardships experienced by a population deprived of basic conditions for dignified survival from childhood. In his youth, he witnessed the hopelessness of his parents, who were forced to migrate to the state capital, Salvador, after losing ownership of their land. Despite precarious social conditions, he managed to enter the job market (as a bank clerk) and enroll in the bachelor’s degree in Public Administration at the Federal University of Bahia (1973-1977).

In his written records concerning his academic career, the author frequently expressed his profound disappointment and disenchantment with the excessively technical, acritical, and socially decontextualized profile that characterized higher education in administration. He asserted that it didn’t take long for him to perceive that the priority of administrative training was to develop procedural-normative competencies aimed at preparing students to meet demands of the job market (both public and private sectors). Disillusioned with the technological focus of the Public Administration course, he decided to abandon it. However, he recounts being advised by Professor João Eurico Matta³ to complete his degree and pursue postgraduate studies in Administration, highlighting that in this new academic environment he could find the answers he sought regarding the social role of administration and administrators (Santos, 2004).

He then decided to follow Professor Matta’s advice and pursue the Master’s Degree in Public Administration at the Brazilian School of Public Administration⁴ (*Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública*) — EBAPE-FGV (1978-1979) from 1978 to 1979. In some of his writings and lectures, he recounts that as he delved deeper into preparatory studies for the master’s program, he was able to better articulate his concerns about the limitations identified in his higher

education, which he classified as the absence of a dedicated field of knowledge that offered theoretical and empirical support for administrative phenomena. However, he points out that during the master's program, he was unable to find the answers he was seeking regarding the substantive and subjective roles he believed the field of administration should fulfill. Given the limitations of administrative and organizational studies, he summarized the challenges and perspectives of contemporary management studies as follows:

... Everyone talks about the current situation and the future — the historian, the sociologist, the political scientist, the economist, even the physicist — but not the administrator. These professionals display such an exaggerated instrumental functionality that the vast majority do not engage in scientific or philosophical speculation. The contemporary administrator has not even worried about debating a seemingly simple question posed by the classics of administration: is administration an art or a science? (Santos, 2004, pp. 22-23)

Upon completing his master's degree, he remained interested in the philosophical and scientific issues in the field of management studies. However, as he needed to dedicate himself to professional⁵ activities, he left these concerns dormant. As highlighted by Paço Cunha (2023), an analysis of the main academic works produced by this thinker between 1979 and 1992 reveals the embryonic foundations of the scientific basis that would support the theory of political administration starting in 1993.

Faced with frustrations regarding the production of knowledge and the training of researchers in administration, he decided to leave the field of administration, opting to seek refuge in the field of political economy. His decision was influenced by his connection with studies on public sector economics, with a focus on theories of public finance, planning, and public policy analysis. As Paço Cunha (2023), highlighted, Santos's intellectual output already indicated his alignment with political economy. This affinity allowed him to skillfully and intellectually employ the epistemic and scientific frameworks of this field to expand the understanding of administrative phenomena, which should be historically grounded. This decision led him to pursue his doctoral studies in the Political Economy Program at the Institute of Economics of the State University of Campinas — Unicamp (1988-1991), where he prioritized deepening the studies he had already been developing on the theories of public finance in modern and contemporary capitalism. He defended his dissertation titled *The history of ideas on the state and public finance in the context of capitalism* in 1991, a study that came to be regarded as the 'cornerstone' for the development of the theory of political administration.

In the introduction to *A administração política como campo do conhecimento (Political administration as a field of knowledge)* (Santos, 2004), the thinker states that as he delved deeper into his doctoral studies, he realized that public finances, although historically considered an object of knowledge within the field of political economy, revealed to be an object proper to the field of administration. This assumption was confirmed as he delved deeper into the classics of political economy and recognized that there lay the essence of the science of political administration, which emerged within the context of modern science and gave support to the historical-social conception and movement of industrial capitalism.

The relevance of this intellectual's trajectory within the doctoral program in political economy for the purposes of this essay is that it signifies his definitive return to the field of administration studies, following a tortuous relationship with the field, which was characterized by a questioning of the technician nature of training and academic studies. It is noteworthy that, although he had successfully defended his doctoral thesis in the field of political economy, he considered the completion of his doctoral studies to represent the beginning of a new and fundamental cycle in his intellectual life. This was due to the fact that it was at that point that the seed of what he called the field of political administration was born. The author's great return to administration studies was marked by the publication of the essay entitled *A administração política brasileira (Brazilian political administration)* (Santos & Ribeiro, 1993), which laid the foundational groundwork for the field.

This initial academic endeavor introduced significant innovations to the study of Brazilian public administration, while also signaling a promising shift for contemporary administration studies. These novel features are evident in the critical epistemic and scientific foundations of historical materialism, which prioritize interpretive approaches derived from the analysis of the economic and geopolitical relations of global capitalism that shaped the patterns of Brazilian political administration between 1930 and 1979. The main goal of this work was to lay the preliminary groundwork for the topic⁶, with the aim of deepening the ongoing national and international debate that challenged the epistemic and scientific limitations of traditional administrative thought in addressing contemporary social challenges.

Building on the results of his doctoral studies, Santos concludes that, ontologically, the fields of classical political economy and political administration share the same scientific object, rooted in understanding the central role of public finance theories in the consolidation and expansion of industrial capitalism. This required acknowledging that the 'management of contemporary capitalism' was driven by the state, which assumed a strategic role in designing,

organizing, and directing the new management model of RSPC&D. Recognizing the historical and social dimension of the science of administration within the context of modernity allows us to understand that social relations in industrial capitalism have their origins in the transformations that took place during the management and governance of emerging socioeconomic and political relations (Santos, 2017).

It can therefore be inferred that recognizing the new social relations of industrial capitalism as a foundational (ontological) element of economics and political administration explains the reasoning behind Santos's argument that the objective and social function of administrative science (political administration) was 'to understand the forms of organization and administration of the new social relations of production [emphasis added] that emerged from the ruins of feudalism and its transitional phase: mercantilism' (Santos, 2017, p. 957). From this perspective, it becomes clearer why Reginaldo Santos identified Adam Smith's concept of 'political economy' (1778) as the source of inspiration for defining the concept of political administration. In this context, a summary of Smith's concept follows, which asserts that:

... political economy, considered as a branch of science proper to a legislator, has two distinct objectives: first, to provide income or maintenance for the population or, more appropriately, to enable them to earn such income or remuneration themselves; second, to provide the state or community with sufficient income for public services (Smith, 1985, p. 357).

After identifying the connections between political administration and the object of study in the economic sciences, Santos delves into another important discussion regarding the contributions and overlaps between the epistemologies and scientific foundations of classical social sciences. In this direction, he highlights a crucial aspect for defining the boundaries of the science of administration by emphasizing the shared concerns of social scientists and economist-philosophers in understanding "... the forms of management of social relations that emerge with Capitalism [emphasis added]." According to Santos, the key distinction between these fields and the science of political administration is that social scientists did not share 'the same concerns [to] understand and explain how the new (capitalist) society was being organized' (Santos, 2017, p. 959).

From this distinction between the fields of political economy and the social sciences, Santos is finally able to define the philosophical and scientific question that embodied his academic concerns, first highlighting the unwillingness (or lack of interest) among administration

scholars to establish their own scientific foundations. On this point, he states:

... it is not that Economics or Sociology are particularly concerned with the organizational forms of society; rather, the issue is that Administration, whether as a practice or in its investigative sphere, has failed to make the intellectual effort to develop epistemological and methodological foundations for understanding macro-level social movements; in short, it has not created a cognitive framework to observe, explain, guide, and direct the social relations of production, realization, and distribution (Santos, 2017, p. 961).

Considering the contextual elements that influenced Reginaldo Santos' academic development and concerns regarding the field of administration studies, it can be claimed that his social thought is grounded in solid epistemological and scientific foundations, particularly in the fundamental contributions from political economy and classical human and social sciences. However, it is important to note that, in his efforts to establish political administration as a distinct field of knowledge, he developed in-depth discussions with the major administrative and organizational theories that emerged from the late 19th to the 20th century.

He integrated into his studies the prominent contributions of Simon (1965) (even though he won the Nobel Prize for economics in 1978, he also stood out for his innovations in the field of behavioral studies, published in his book *Comportamento administrativo: Estudo dos processos decisórios nas organizações administrativas* — 1965) Guerreiro Ramos (1965, 1983, 1989), Burrell and Morgan (1979). He also incorporated the contributions of classical public administration thinkers, particularly, Waldo (1964), (in his 1964 book, *O estudo administrativo público*, he assumed the interaction between administrative studies and the social sciences, aligning with the arguments put forth by Guerreiro Ramos, João Ubaldo Ribeiro, and other scholars), Dimock et al. (1961), in which the authors highlight the debate on why is administration political?, taking up a reflection that began in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, in which Santos (2004) observed the central relationship between administration and politics, as well as Dimock (1968), based on the work *Filosofia da administração*, in which Dimock makes an important effort to move beyond the conventional definitions of administrative studies as a set of technical instruments which have provided guidance for administrative actions in contemporary organizations, heirs to the classical debate in this field led by Wilson (1887), Goodnow (2003) and Weber (1993, 2011), who introduced the pivotal discussion of the central relationship between 'administration' and 'politics' into social sciences.

Over a decade after the publication of the first article that inaugurated this new field, Santos presented progress in his own research, conducted between 1994 and 2003, by releasing the first edition of one of his most important works on the subject, which underscores his contributions to the field of contemporary administration: *Political administration as a field of knowledge (A administração política como campo do conhecimento)* (Santos, 2004, a second edition was published in 2010). As the author points out, the ontological-epistemological and scientific foundations of the classical social sciences and administrative sciences were rooted in the profound economic, social, cultural, political, and administrative transformations that marked the advent of modernity. He thus recognizes that the founding principles of modern society, which provided the ideological, scientific, and technical-technological basis for the consolidation and expansion of industrial capitalism, were fundamentally established by shifts in the management patterns of RSPC&D.

Continuing the debate on contemporary administrative thought, Santos engaged in a careful reading of the works of Frederick Taylor and Henri Fayol, focusing on *Principles of scientific management* (Taylor, 1991) and *Industrial and general administration: Forecasting, organization, command, coordination, and control* (Fayol, 1958). His central argument concerning the ontological-epistemological and scientific limitations of classical administrative studies lies in the identity and subordination of these studies to the philosophy of neoclassical economics, based on the principles of economic utilitarianism, defended by Mill (2005). He claims that this ahistorical adherence distanced scientific and classical administration from critical philosophical and theoretical perspectives capable of expanding the understanding of administrative phenomena beyond micro-organizational contexts. He argues that the conception and dynamics of 'administrative acts and facts' — as expressions of complex social phenomena — can only be understood and contextualized within the broader framework of the relationships between society, the state, and the economy (Santos, 2004, pp. 25-26).

He concludes his review of the contributions made by the theories of administration (public, scientific, and classical) and organization to the consolidation of political administration by noting that these approaches did not demonstrate an inclination to conceptualize administrative phenomena as social phenomena. This enabled the author to announce that:

... from a scientific framework perspective, administration is an entirely undefined 'disciplinary field,' either because scholars do not care much about it, or, when some importance is given, it is

done incorrectly, especially with regard to its object (Santos, 2004, p. 36).

Noting that there were no consistent contributions from classical thinkers in defining the object of knowledge appropriate for management science, the researcher's next step was to turn to identifying the contributions of the theories of institutionalism, managerialism, and regulationism — areas linked to the studies of economics. In discussing with these schools, Santos recognizes that contemporary economists continue to fulfill the role and task that political administrators have to perform in the effort to understand new management patterns and forms of (re)organization of RSPC&D that emerged between the beginning and the second half of the 20th century (Santos, 2004, p. 21). This discussion is relevant for updating the debate on what field of knowledge should administration undertake, as revealed in the privileged space for this debate in the aforementioned work (Santos, 2004).

However, despite acknowledging the fundamental role that economics (both classical and neoclassical) plays in interpreting administrative phenomena, Santos does not, as some critics argue, advocate for the subordination of political administration to the objectives, functions, objects, and methods of economic science. A close review of his works shows that his initial aim was to recognize the convergence of the object of knowledge forms of management and organizational modes of social relations of production that these two fields have historically shared. Secondly, it is crucial to stress that, while acknowledging the intersections between these two fields, his primary concern was to point out that the lack of intellectual engagement among administration scholars allowed economists to occupy this prominent position: conceptualizing administrative and organizational phenomena. He acknowledges, nevertheless, that economists lack the ontological-epistemological and scientific expertise to address the specific issues of strategic management phenomena, which are the exclusive domain of the science of administration.

To clarify the role of political administrators (philosophers of administration), Santos aimed to delineate the boundaries between these two fields of knowledge — economics and political administration — essential for defining the philosophical, scientific, and praxiological foundations of social materiality (both socioeconomic and symbolic) that emerges from modernity. In this regard, he distinguishes that political economy addresses social questions like 'why produce?', 'for what purpose?', and 'for whom?', while political administration is tasked with answering complementary but equally important questions, such as 'how to produce?', 'how to organize?', and 'how to implement?' new patterns of RSPC&D, in order to

ensure the attainment of desirable levels of efficiency and effectiveness, aligned with justice and social inclusion.

By delineating the object of knowledge of the science of political administration within the dimensions of 'management,' 'organizational forms,' and 'appropriate execution standards' of socio-productive relations, Santos repositions the social role of administrative knowledge, contributing to the renewal of both the theoretical and practical debate on contemporary administration. This effort becomes significant by allowing the field of administration to attain the same level of social recognition as political economy and the human and social sciences. Santos aimed to demonstrate that the science of administration, in the context of new RSPC&D, was responsible for answering the question: 'How to produce practical ways of life that ensure conditions for social well-being?'

By prioritizing the subjective and substantive aspects that define the phenomena of management, Santos emphasizes that, although this philosophical issue might initially seem like a minor social problem — due to its association with less observed praxiological concerns —, it conveys fundamental philosophical, theoretical, and empirical elements that are essential for redirecting new approaches to understanding the broader, historically informed social and organizational reality, as well as guiding how RSPC&D should be managed and organized. This recognition implies that the social role of the science of political administration extends beyond the procedural-normative aspects typically associated with managerial dimensions, acknowledging the principles and values that should guide collective ways of life.

Recognizing the subjective and substantive roles that underpin administrative knowledge and practices required significant intellectual effort from Santos to define the ontological, epistemological, and theoretical foundations that would support this new field of knowledge. He posited that reflecting (abstracting) on 'how to act' is not related to the formal-bureaucratic aspects of management. Contrary to this instrumentalist expectation, he argues that questioning 'how to act?' requires advancing the recognition of the essence or nature (ontology) of administrative phenomena, as expressed through the dimensions of existential philosophy and the conception of the nation/society/humanity project. Building on these fundamental arguments, Santos reinforces that the primary objective of 'administrative acts and facts' is connected to the theoretical-abstract effort to understand and define the modes of societal intervention as expressed through the relationships between society, the state, and the economy.

After developing a broad and contextualized understanding of the significant role of administrative phenomena in shaping the foundations of modern and

contemporary socio economies, the next step was to advance the conception of the general theoretical framework for the field. By outlining the general contours of the field, Santos focused on building the theoretical, methodological, and analytical foundations that would guide the development of new critical studies in administration. It can be inferred that his efforts were aimed at guiding interpretations of social and organizational reality, with the goal of recognizing the various forms of (re)construction of collective life, based on the 'practical ways of life' championed by Hannah Arendt, inspired by Aristotelian thought (Azevedo & Grave, 2014; Filippin, 2017).

The synthesis of Reginaldo Santos' social thought was completed in his last work (still unpublished) entitled *Political administration is (almost) everything: Intentionality, conception, movement and purpose (A administração política é (quase) tudo: Intencionalidade, concepção, movimento e finalidade)*. With this bold title, Santos wanted to translate the general theoretical referential scheme and the onto-epistemological and theoretical structure and movement (*esquema referencial teórico geral e a estrutura e movimento onto-epistemológico e teórico*) that underlies his construct. In this scheme, he was able to associate the philosophical, theoretical, and empirical bases that anchor political administration: (a) the onto-epistemological dimension (associated with the philosophy of social existence); (b) the dimension of materialization of management standards (associated with the execution of RSPC&D, considering relationships between society, the state, and the economy); and (c) the philosophical dimension (associated with becoming).

It can be inferred that the theoretical-logical framework represented, in the set of his relevant works, the expansion of the original referential scheme, presented in the work *Political administration as a field of knowledge* (Santos, 2004), incorporating aspects that were missing to complete the onto-epistemological and theoretical structure and movement of political administration. Reading this final synthesis requires those interested in learning this theory to return to the work *Theoretical and methodological bases of political administration* (Santos et al., 2009), since this essay contains elements that would support definition of the philosophical and scientific aspects that would consecrate the bases of this new field of knowledge.

To address some of the criticisms aimed at the theory of political administration, particularly those involving confusion between this new field and the concept of public administration (a confusion likely caused by the limitations of the general theoretical framework published in 2004), the new diagram is considered to address these concerns by expanding the philosophical, theoretical, and empirical perspective of this emerging field of knowledge. It situates Santos' thesis within the category of what Faria (2022)

calls the ‘epistemological act’ of political administration. To substantiate political administration as a distinct area of knowledge, it was necessary to advance the definition of its ontological-epistemological and scientific structures and movements.

The incorporation of philosophical insights (with an emphasis on the philosophy of existence) represents another innovation introduced by Santos to the science of political administration, as it underscores the need to integrate administrative thought and action in an inseparable way. According to Santos, establishing a connection between the processes of ‘thinking’ and ‘acting’ makes it possible to bring about the necessary transformations in concrete social reality through the dynamic and dialectical integration of ‘intentionality,’ ‘conception,’ ‘movement,’ and ‘purpose.’ This approach enabled Santos to endorse the category of totality as a representation of the articulation between the theories of political administration and professional administration, the concepts of ‘strategic management’ and ‘operational management,’ and the acts of ‘thinking’ and ‘acting.’

CONTRIBUTIONS OF POLITICAL ADMINISTRATION TO THE CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT THEORIES AND PRACTICES

To recognize the contributions of political administration to the theoretical and practical discussions of contemporary administration, it is necessary to acknowledge the challenges posed by an approach that is still in its early stages and presents itself as a counterpoint to the traditional perspectives that continue to dominate the field of administrative and organizational studies, as is the case with various other academic movements situated in the spectrum of critical management and organizational studies. This challenge is compounded by the fact that this emerging field is working to identify and validate the essence of a still-unknown body of knowledge, which emphasizes the political and subjective dimensions of administrative phenomena — an agenda still largely controlled by traditional managerial thinking.

The theoretical, methodological, and empirical contributions of political administration studies are deemed valuable, despite navigating choppy seas. In the theoretical realm, the effort to establish a new field of knowledge aimed at positioning contemporary administration as an autonomous field of study — while still inter- and

multidisciplinary in its integration with the human and social sciences — is noteworthy. As a scientific field, contemporary administration must, first and foremost, consolidate its philosophical and theoretical-methodological foundations to address the following administrative problem: ‘Why have social processes been managed in a way that deepens the historical-social movement of exclusion, to the point of threatening the existence of a significant portion of humanity?’

To answer this question, administration scholars must develop critical foundations for their ontological, epistemological, and theoretical-methodological approaches. These foundations must be robust enough to allow the field to interpret administrative phenomena as broad, historically situated social phenomena. In this regard, some of the most significant contributions to the theoretical field of political administration can be found in the seminal works *Political administration as a field of knowledge* (Santos, 2004), *Theoretical and methodological bases of political administration* (Santos et al., 2009) and the forthcoming *Political administration is (almost) everything: Intentionality, conception, movement, and purpose* (Santos, in press).

Still in the theoretical realm, three studies developed by Santos that use the constructs of political administration as a foundation can be identified as significant contributions. The first is the book *Theory of public finance in the context of capitalism — A discussion with philosopher-economists: from Smith to Keynes* (Santos, 2013), a reference work for Santos, as it was the starting point for the creation of the concept of political administration. The second theoretical work deepens the ideas presented in said book, focusing on the debate on public finance through the lens of John Maynard Keynes’ contributions to the theory of political administration. In this context, Santos presents a provocation in the title of the work itself: “Keynes and the proposal of political administration for capitalism: A critique of the assumptions of the externality of the state and the fiscal crisis” (Santos, 2010a). As previously mentioned, the author’s goal was to position the theory of political administration within the framework of classical economic thought, to reinforce that the field already exists but lacks the necessary movement from administrators to fully claim it. The first step is to undertake an urgent re-reading of the contributions of classical economics and the social sciences as legitimate representatives of the theory of political administration. The next step is to advance the debate on the epistemic and scientific foundations to prepare the field to take its place of prominence in society.

The third theoretical study updates the analytical perspective on the dynamics of contemporary capitalism through the essay *The crisis, the state, and the misunderstandings of political administration in contemporary capitalism* (Santos et al., 2016). In this important text, the product of research conducted by the political administration study group, the focus was on using the ontological, epistemological, and theoretical foundations of political administration to reinterpret the crisis of contemporary capitalism. To achieve this, an extensive debate was held across the theoretical fields that explore the concept of crisis. The text introduced both theoretical and empirical innovations by analyzing the shifts in management patterns within today's capitalism, emphasizing the role played by the state in this context. It recognized how public power has been critical in maintaining the stability of current political administration patterns of financialized capitalism and, additionally, highlighted the significant impacts of this shift on the process of national economic depatrimonialization and the risks to the sustainability of the global socioeconomic system.

In the empirical and praxeological fields, the contributions are also significant and show a high degree of consolidation. The first effort in this direction was the seminal study on the subject, titled *Brazilian political administration* (Santos & Ribeiro, 1993). This text is highly important as it introduces the fundamental elements that would later form the foundation of the field. The essay includes both the innovations of empirical studies in this emerging field and is grounded in new critical theoretical elements anchored in historical materialism, applied to the field of administration. In this context, to interpret the conception and dynamics of contemporary Brazilian administration, in a field still under construction, the authors employed the interpretation of the relationships between society, the state, and the economy as a theoretical-methodological tool. This reflects the commitment of these new studies to the idea that the trajectory of Brazilian political administration could only be reinterpreted by incorporating expanded theoretical-methodological elements, which would allow for an understanding of how the management patterns of RSPC&D within the national development project were shaped.

Inspired by this first theoretical-analytical and empirical effort, another essay was produced as a result of further research in the field. This new essay sought to complement the previous study on the reinterpretation

of contemporary Brazilian administration, focusing on the period from 1980 to 2002. The title of this new work, *Productive restructuring of the Brazilian state from the perspective of the neoliberal project* (Santos et al., 2004) reflects the ongoing concern within the field to interpret global transformations within the national context. Building on the research agenda established in the earlier text, this essay aimed to examine the process of de-structuring the management patterns of Brazilian RSPC&D, which resulted from the social depatrimonialization process that began in the 1980s and is still underway. This second theoretical and empirical work complemented the reinterpretation of Brazil's socioeconomic, political, and administrative formation, a re-reading that spans over 70 years of the trajectory of national political administration (which integrates public, private, and social administration movements). It is important to highlight that both studies are notable for integrating future research agendas that have served as sources of inspiration for the development of numerous dissertation and thesis projects.

These considerations on the impacts of political administration studies on contemporary administration theories and practices can be complemented with the data presented in the table below, which provides numerical insights into the developments this new field of knowledge has aimed to achieve. The data also highlights the growing interest in producing new studies based on this approach (monographs, dissertations, theses, articles, books, book chapters, teaching methodologies, management technologies, among others). The limitations of this essay prevent a deeper exploration of the qualitative aspects of the works highlighted in the table below, which would showcase the theoretical, methodological, and practical impacts that many of these studies have made.

It is important to highlight that extension activities have been gradually integrated into the theoretical and practical studies developed in the field of political administration, as a result of technical cooperation established between UFBA, public authorities (state and municipal), and social associations. This articulation between teaching, research, and extension is considered fundamental if theoretical-methodological and empirical advances are to result in effective transformations in social relations.

Table 1. Survey of knowledge production in political administration (1993-2023).

| Production | NPGA/PDGS-UFBA | | Outher Programs ¹ | | Total |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Theoretical studies | Empirical studies | Theoretical studies | Empirical studies | |
| Research groups in development | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| National researchers network ² | | | | | 1 |
| International researchers network ³ | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Research projects under development ⁴ | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| Completed master's dissertations | 13 | 7 | | | 20 |
| Master's dissertations in progress | | 4 | | 1 | 5 |
| Doctoral theses completed | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 14 |
| Doctoral theses in progress | 3 | | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Completed course final papers | | 3 | | | 3 |
| Published books | Political administration collection | 6 | | | 6 |
| | Other publications | 2 | | | 2 |
| Articles published in national journals ⁵ | 24 | | | | 24 |
| Organization of national scientific events | 9 | | | | 9 |
| Organization of international events | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation with public organizations | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation with social organizations | 8 | | | | 8 |
| Scientific journal | | 1 ⁶ | | | 1 |

Note. Source: Authors' own elaboration. 1. The external programs that have adopted the epistemic and scientific bases of political administration are as follows (presented in order of defense of the doctoral theses): (a) University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain); (b) University of Trás-os-Montes and Alto Douro (Portugal), in co-tutelage with NPGA; (c) Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ) — IUPERJ; (d) Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). 2. In 2017, at the National Political Administration Meeting held in Juiz de Fora (UFJF), the National Political Administration Network (RNAP) was established. It is comprised of professors and researchers from the following national universities: UFBA, UESB, UNEB, UFAL, UESC, UECR, UFRGS, FGV EAESP, PUC-SP, UFJF, UFF, UFRB, UNIVASF, and UNIFACS. 3. In 2018, following the National Political Administration Meeting, held at the State University of Santa Cruz (UESC), located in the city of Ilhéus-BA, the International Development, Public Policy and Management Network (REDESPOL) was established, comprising researchers from Brazilian universities (UFBA, UESB, UNEB, UESC, UNIVASF, UNIFACS and Unicamp), and international universities (Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas — UAT, Mexico; Universidad Autónoma de Chiapas — UNACH, Mexico; Universidad de Oriente — UO, Cuba; Universidad de Santiago de Compostela — USC, Spain). 4. Research projects were considered and are under development by researchers who are members of the RNAP and whose titles explicitly reference the field of political administration as a theoretical basis. 5. Only articles published by Santos or with co-authors that reference the production of seminal works in the field were taken into consideration. 6. *Revista Brasileira de Administração Política* (REBAP), created in 2008 in partnership with Editora Hucitec.

Other significant developments that have contributed to the consolidation and dissemination of theoretical and practical advances in the field are the scientific events organized by networks of researchers (at the national, state, and international levels). This effort was initiated with the creation of the National Meeting of Political Administration for the Development of Brazil (ENAP) in 2010 in the city of Garanhuns, PE, and is now in its 9th edition. One of the objectives of this event, conceived by Santos as part of a 'movement,' is the commitment to contribute to Brazil's development, with an emphasis on the expansion of studies within the country's interior. To achieve this goal, Reginaldo Santos published a document in 2010 titled *Manifesto of Political Administration for the Development of Brazil (Manifesto da administração política para o desenvolvimento do Brasil)* (Santos, 2010). This is yet another reference work in the field, which has inspired and guided all events held up to 2018. In response to the challenges posed by the global pandemic, the Bahia Political Administration Meeting (EBAP) was established with the objective of reinforcing the

network of researchers in the state of Bahia. The initiative aimed to enhance the capabilities of research groups on the subject in the interior of the state, with a particular focus on state and federal universities, federal institutes, public organizations, and other interested institutions.

Following a concise overview of the thinker's most significant contributions to the field of political administration, it is essential to present the efforts made by the author to delineate the theoretical and methodological foundations of the field (Santos et al., 2009). Undoubtedly, this was one of the most challenging aspects of this intellectual movement, which is still evolving, as it involved establishing minimum scientific parameters to guide the production of new knowledge that serves as a counterpoint to traditional standards, which are grounded in utilitarian and instrumentalist rationality.

The author's starting point for advancing this exercise was to consider the concept of management as a guiding framework for provisionally defining the basic assumptions

and general laws of political administration. Starting from the premise that political administration aims to conceive and implement a management model for RSPC&D committed to ensuring the well-being of society/humanity, the key methodological question was: “Which method(s) would best fulfill this purpose?” Since this new field stands in opposition to the philosophical and scientific foundations of traditional administration, the thinker had only one certainty: the new method would need to break away from the dominant ideology that has guided (administered) RSPC&D since antiquity, maintaining the preservation of social order (political stability) as a fundamental political tool to safeguard socio-economic interests (development/growth). In this equation, the variable of distribution or social justice has not been a significant factor, remaining dependent on the other determinants (political and economic).

Based on this evidence, the author proposes a ‘transformative method’ that involves reversing the classical socio-political and economic patterns (established through various historically situated modes of social production: slavery, feudalism, and capitalism). To break away from the prevailing logic, he suggests the PQNR method, which, in short, means considering that “For any level of income [emphasis added], we must adopt a distribution policy [aimed at making it possible to achieve] social well-being” (Santos et al., 2009, p. 933). This method rests on two main assumptions:

Assumption 1 — If we understand that the process of human civilization aims to free individuals as early as possible from the need to secure materiality, then the purpose of human labor, ‘which manages the construction of social relations of production and distribution,’ must always be tied to the liberation of individuals and their well-being.

Assumption 2 — If the purpose of labor is to foster freedom with the highest possible degree of well-being, ‘we must create a philosophy of science guided by the concept of totality. It is no longer suitable to develop knowledge based on the division between what is considered pure (scientific) knowledge and applied (normative and prescriptive) knowledge’ [emphasis added].

To clarify the meaning and significance of the PQNR method, it is important to highlight the arguments defended by Santos regarding this original and transformative proposition of the established order. He emphasizes that if:

... the methodological proposal for Political Administration [of contemporary capitalism] seeks to invert the terms of the equation [of traditional

thinking], then its starting point should be [to recognize the following equation]: ‘For any level of income (PQNR)’, we must adopt a distribution policy [aimed at achieving] well-being. After this process, if it is found that social income . . . is insufficient to overcome materiality and ensure . . . well-being, an economic growth policy must be implemented to expand social wealth to humanly required levels (Santos et al., 2009, pp. 932-933).

In light of these assumptions, the author advances the definition of three principles or general laws that, at that stage of theoretical development, he believed should be understood and established in advance by researchers to ensure that the “... goals of humanity can be achieved with the least social cost or in the shortest possible time” (Santos et al., 2009, pp. 932-933):

(a) Only build something new after fully utilizing what already exists (reducing waste and respecting what has already been built through collective effort);

(b) To legitimize (integrate) the Nation Project or any organization/institution, it is necessary to relativize the hierarchy of the processes of building it (eliminating the hierarchical approach promoted by the mechanized conception of traditional administration); and

(c) Depending on the determined result, the most suitable management form for any project (whether individual, organizational, or national) is conditioned on understanding its temporality (improving the governance process of the nation project and its temporalities).

Since the publication of the essay *Theoretical and methodological bases of political administration* (Santos et al., 2009), the author has continued to develop and refine this preliminary exercise, progressively incorporating new laws, which he refers to as preliminary lessons. By the time he had completed his last work, which is still unpublished, Santos (in press) the author has continued to develop and refine this preliminary exercise, progressively incorporating new laws, which he refers to as preliminary lessons. By the time he had completed his last work, which is still unpublished, — (Santos, in press) demonstrates the author’s dedication to addressing contemporary challenges by refining the theories and practices of contemporary administration.

Finally, as previously indicated in the introduction, political administration, based on the seminal work of Santos and the theoretical and, above all, applied studies that have been developed, as shown above, has contributed to understanding contemporary dilemmas.

This has been achieved through the construction of its own indispensable knowledge by the science of administration for the conception, organization, and management of social processes. Two of these dilemmas warrant particular attention: the advance of conservatism and climate issues.

In regard to issues related to conservatism — whose repercussions on the structure of the state and public policies have been vast and deep — expressed through the rise of extreme right-wing political movements globally (and clearly in Brazil), which promote regressive political, social, economic, and civilizational agendas, these phenomena reflect the *modus operandi* of contemporary anti-competitive and precarious capitalism. Political administration is a framework capable of analyzing how such phenomena permeate the structures of administration: public, business, and societal. It does so by comprehending and exploring the political dimension in the analysis of social processes, particularly in their organization, management, and purpose. Additionally, it highlights the relationship between the field of administration and social and class relations linked to the production and distribution of socially produced income and wealth.

The political administration of contemporary capitalism has resulted in the deepening of social inequalities and the mentioned precariousness of work, which has led to a loss of trust in politics, institutions, and in the civilized resolution of conflicts. It is in this context that the extreme right thrives, adopting simplistic and moralistic ‘solutions’ to complex economic issues, which reflect the ‘anti-system’ logic of outsiders. The conceptual and methodological framework proposed by Santos enables an analysis of how these phenomena manifest across various forms of administration given his critique of the ‘technical’ conception of administration: in corporations, the state, and in broader social processes.

Likewise, climate change, which is having a severe impact on regions, countries, and the planet — with Rio Grande do Sul (RS) serving as a paradigmatic case —, represents another area where political administration can contribute by linking the political economy of contemporary capitalism to governance, management, and administrative strategies. The case of Rio Grande do Sul exemplifies how private agribusiness interests, combined with extreme flexibilization of public environmental management (governance and public policies) by the Porto Alegre city administration and the Rio Grande do Sul government, exacerbated the global effects of the climate emergency. The ‘perfect storm’ can thus be analyzed through the methodological tools of political administration.

The problems and challenges highlighted, among many others that could be mentioned, illustrate the

analytical potential of political administration to critically and comprehensively examine diverse, complex, and contradictory contemporary events, where management has gained prominence as a field of knowledge. As Santos (in press), highlights, if the societal project were oriented toward the purpose of social relations, grounded in:

... the philosophy of existence and the principles of Political Administration, it would undoubtedly allow for better coordinated control of the instabilities in economic movements, producing results more consistent with both general and specific, group, or sectoral interests.

The author concludes that “... it is the content of Administration, particularly Political Administration, that is missing from contemporary social thought and urgently needs to be addressed.”

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

As emphasized throughout this essay, the social context in which the political administration movement emerged is marked by profound transformations in the social relations of production, which now shape the management patterns of capitalism. These shifts, much like the historical and social movements that defined the revolutions of modernity, have deepened social inequalities and heightened economic turbulence and uncertainty. This conservative trend has made it impossible to sustain the expected ‘stability’ of the current social order, provoking new conflicts and reawakening others that had been dormant but ever watchful.

In response to this scenario of widespread disruption, Santos envisioned a prominent role for political administration studies in interpreting a reality marked by both old and new social challenges. This essay offers reflections on the significance of the social thought produced by this still-underappreciated intellectual, who has left a legacy that promises further advances initial steps of which are already bearing fruit. Notably, the epistemic and scientific framework developed by Reginaldo Santos has gained prominence for its methodological approach, which recognizes the object of knowledge in management science, namely ‘management,’ as a means of interpreting administrative phenomena within the context of social and organizational dynamics.

As emphasized in this article, political administration elevates the epistemological domain of administration, granting it the status of a science rather than merely the culmination point of other sciences. Therefore, we may conclude that political administration, as proposed by

Bourdieu (1983), constitutes a distinct ‘scientific field,’ characterized by its own set of rules, dynamics, and disputes. Consequently, political administration seeks to challenge the prevailing paradigm by revealing the power inherent in management. This phenomenon can also be framed within the analytical framework of Khun (1970), who, in his analysis of scientific revolutions, highlighted the strong resistance of ‘normal science,’ the dominant paradigm, to change.

Thus, if administration implies power, this assertion gains analytical depth when we examine the guiding principles of political administration. Often, political dimensions are obscured by hegemonic science — which controls key positions in funding bodies, editorial policies, and institutions in the ‘field of administration’ — by presenting administration as merely ‘technical,’ ‘applied,’ and ‘neutral,’ without challenging the foundations of power and its ties to social relations. This approach manifests in public administration, corporate settings, and other forms of management, where the structures and dynamics of contemporary capitalist society are normalized.

By unraveling these ‘mysteries’ and lifting the veils that obscure them, an undeniably Herculean task political administration contributes — still from a possible perspective of Thomas Kuhn — to a paradigm shift in the field of administration, granting it epistemological autonomy, as discussed earlier. This movement is both intellectual and aligned with the democratic political struggle (seeking equality in political and economic terms), involving paradigm disputes and, consequently, challenging dominant ideas. Reginaldo Santos initiated and led this process, both in his personal life and through the remarkable work he left behind for further development, expansion, and application. As a result, he is recognized as one of the visionary thinkers who, above all, displayed courage in challenging paradigms and the power structures that support them in the name of science, equality, and democracy.

Certainly, the works produced by this thinker open up vast and productive opportunities to develop new lines of research in the field of management, with an emphasis on the approaches of political administration and professional administration, which enable the observation and intervention in strategic and operational management processes. To inspire new studies on the author’s thought, a proposed agenda is presented for future research. As Reginaldo Santos would suggest, one of the most urgent challenges is the effort to test the theoretical and methodological assumptions defined, based on the 11 preliminary lessons identified.

Finally, the research agenda of political administration is still in its early stages. Most importantly, its theoretical

structure is in place and has the potential to address and shape the contemporary world. In the Brazilian context, the fight against various inequalities and the strengthening of national and popular sovereignty — both encapsulated in the nation project — are among the key elements of Reginaldo Souza Santos’s legacy.

NOTES


1. Born in the spring of 1950, on October 10th, he passed away in the same season on October 23, 2022.
2. For example, studies by Guerreiro Ramos, João Ubaldo Ribeiro, Mauricio Tragtenberg, Ramon Garcia, Prestes Motta, Paulo Emilio Matos, José Henrique de Faria, Ana Paula Paes de Paula, Ariston Azevedo, Maurício Serva, Pedro Lincoln, Alketa Peci, Elcemir Paço Cunha, Deise Ferraz, Elinaldo Leal, Alex Saraiva, Marcelo Bispo, among others.
3. Professor and Director of the School of Administration at UFBA, when Reginaldo Santos was a student, and a renowned academic, with a strong performance in the area of extension and technical training of public managers for the state of Bahia and other states in the Northeast Region, between the 1960s and 1970s.
4. At that time, the school only worked in the field of Public Administration, later including Business Administration training.
5. He began his professional career in the Bahia state government as a technician in the State Planning Center (1979-1981) and in the Finance Department (1977-1986). In 1983, he became a professor at the UFBA School of Administration, where he worked until 2022.
6. We recommend reading the article *A integração do plano analítico da administração política (The integration of the analytical plan: Studies in the field of political administration)* (Santos, 2017), where the author presents, in a clearer and more didactic way, the assumptions that underpin the onto epistemological and scientific bases of political administration.

REFERENCES

- Azevedo, A., & Grave, P. S. (2014). Prolegômenos a toda a administração possível: Administração - O que é isso? *Organizações & Sociedade*, (71), 695-712. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1984-92302014217100009>
- Bertero, C. O., Caldas, M. P., & Wood, T., Jr. (1999). Produção científica em administração de empresas: provocações, insinuações e contribuições para um debate. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 3(1), 147-178. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1415-65551999000100009>
- Bourdieu, P. (1983). O campo científico. In R. Ortiz (Org.). *Pierre Bourdieu: Sociologia*. Ática.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. Routledge.
- Chancel, L., Piketty, T., Saez, E., & Zucman, G. (2022). *World Inequality Report 2022*. World Inequality Lab. https://wir2022.wid.world/www-site/uploads/2022/03/0098-21_WIL_RIM_RAPPORT_A4.pdf
- Dimock, M. E. (1968). *Filosofia da administração*. Fundo de Cultura.
- Dimock, M. E., Dimock, G. O., & Koenig, L. W. (1961). *Public administration*. Rinehart and Winston
- Dowbor, L. (2017). *A era do capital improdutivo*. Autonomia Literária.
- Dardot, T., & Laval, C. (2016). A nova razão do mundo – ensaio sobre a sociedade neoliberal. Boitemp. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-49792018000100012>
- Faria, J. H. (2022) Introdução à epistemologia: dimensões do ato epistemológico. Paco.
- Fayol, H. (1958). *Administração industrial e geral: Previsão, organização, comando, coordenação e controle*. Atlas. (Obra original publicada em 1917).
- Filippin, M. (2017). *Administração e Política: que relação é esta?* 2017. 156 f. Tese (Doutorado em Administração), Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre.
- Goodnow, F. J. (2003 [1990]). *Politics and Administration: A study in government*. [3rd ed.]. Transaction Publishers. (Obra original publicada em 1900).
- Khun, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Mattos, P. L. C. L. (2009). “Administração é ciência ou arte?” O que podemos aprender com este mal-entendido. *Revista de Administração de Empresa*, 49(3), 349-360. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-75902009000300009>
- Mill, J. S. (2005). *Utilitarismo*. Porto Editora. (Obra original publicada em 1861).
- Paço Cunha, E. (2023). Administração Política no itinerário intelectual de Reginaldo Souza Santos (1980-1993). *Revista Brasileira de Administração Política*, 15(1), 1-45. <https://doi.org/10.9771/rebap.v0i1.55277>
- Ramos, G. (1965). *A redução sociológica*. Tempo Brasileiro.
- Ramos, G. (1983). *Administração e Contexto brasileiro*. FGV.
- Ramos, G. (1989). *A nova ciência das organizações*. FGV.
- Santos, R. S. (2004). *A administração política como campo do conhecimento*. Hucitec.
- Santos, R. S. (2010). *Manifesto da Administração Política para o desenvolvimento do Brasil*. Garanhuns, PE.
- Santos, R. S. (2013). *As teorias das finanças públicas no contexto do capitalismo: uma discussão com os filósofos economistas: de Smith a Keynes*. Hucitec.
- Santos, R. S. (2017). A integração do plano analítico: os estudos do campo da administração política. *Farol - Revista de Estudos Organizacionais e Sociedade*, 4(10). <https://revistas.face.ufmg.br/index.php/farol/article/view/4015>
- Santos, R. S. (No prelo). *A administração política é (quase) tudo: intencionalidade, concepção, movimento e finalidade*. Hucitec.
- Santos, R. S., & Ribeiro, E. M. (1993). A administração política brasileira. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 27(4), 102-135. <https://periodicos.fgv.br/rap/article/view/8553>
- Santos, R. S., Ribeiro, E. M., Ribeiro, M. M., Santos, T. C. S., & Costa V. M. (2004). Reestruturação produtiva do Estado brasileiro na perspectiva do projeto neoliberal. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 1(38), 7-32. <https://periodicos.fgv.br/rap/article/view/6525>
- Santos, R. S., Ribeiro, E. M., & Santos, T. C. S. (2009). Bases teórico-metodológicas da administração política. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 43(4), 919-941. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-76122009000400008>
- Santos, R. S., Gomes, F. G., Santos, T. C. S., Ribeiro, E. M., & Andrade, L. M. Filho. (2016). A crise, o Estado e os equívocos da administração política do capitalismo contemporâneo. *Cad. EBAPE.BR*, 14(4), 1011-1034. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1679-395130795>
- Simon, H. (1965). *Comportamento administrativo: Estudo dos processos decisórios nas organizações administrativas*. FGV.
- Smith, A. (1985). *A riqueza das nações: investigação sobre sua natureza e suas causas*. Nova Cultural.
- Taylor, F. (1991). *Princípios da administração científica*. Atlas. (Obra original publicada em 1911)
- Teixeira, F. (2008). Administração Política: surge um novo paradigma de pesquisa em área contestada. *Revista Brasileira de Administração Política*, 1(1), 5-6. <https://periodicos.ufba.br/index.php/rebap/article/view/15686>
- Waldo, D. (1964). *O estudo administrativo público*. FGV.
- Weber, M. (1993). *Parlamento e governo na Alemanha reordenada: Crítica política do funcionalismo e da natureza dos partidos*. Vozes. (Obra original publicada em 1918).
- Weber, M. (2011). A Política como vocação. In: *Ciência e política: Duas vocações*. 18a. ed. Cultrix. (Obra original publicada em 1919).
- Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(1), 197- 222. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2139277>
- World Bank. (2024). GDP growth (annual %) – 1961-2023. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG>

Authorship


Elizabeth Matos Ribeiro

Universidade Federal da Bahia, Escola de Administração
Av. Miguel Calmon, s/n, Vale do Canela, CEP 40110-903, Salvador, BA, Brazil
E-mail: ematos@ufba.br
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4976-9761>

Mônica Matos Ribeiro*

Universidade do Estado da Bahia, Departamento de Ciências Humanas
Rua Tenente Coronel Bandeira de Melo, s/n°, Calabar, CEP 44444-032, Santo Antônio de Jesus, BA, Brazil
E-mail: moniribeiromatoss@gmail.com
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5141-9272>

Francisco César Pinto da Fonseca

Fundação Getúlio Vargas, Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo
Av. Nove de Julho, n. 2029, Bela Vista, CEP 01313-902, São Paulo, SP, Brazil
E-mail: francisco.fonseca@fgv.br
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2617-8926>

* Corresponding Author

Call for Papers

This Provocation was submitted to the *FORUM Recognizing Authors / Thinkers, Research Groups and National Institutions and their Contributions to the Theory and Practice of Contemporary Administration* promoted by RAC.

Copyrights

The authors retain the copyright relating to their article and grant the journal RAC, from ANPAD, the right of first publication, with the work simultaneously licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC BY 4.0).

Conflict of Interests

The author informed that there is no conflict of interests.

Authors' Contributions

1st author: conceptualization (lead), writing – original draft (equal), writing – review and editing (supporting), validation (equal).

2nd author: project administration (lead), conceptualization (supporting), writing – original draft (equal), validation (equal).

3rd author: conceptualization (supporting), writing – original draft (equal), writing – review and editing (lead), validation (equal).

Funding

The authors reported that there was no funding for the research in this article.

Peer Review Method

This content was evaluated using the double-blind peer review process. The disclosure of the reviewers' information on the first page, as well as the Peer Review Report, is made only after concluding the evaluation process, and with the voluntary consent of the respective reviewers and authors.

Plagiarism Check

RAC maintains the practice of submitting all documents approved for publication to the plagiarism check, using specific tools, e.g.: iThenticate.

Data Availability

RAC encourages data sharing but, in compliance with ethical principles, it does not demand the disclosure of any means of identifying research subjects, preserving the privacy of research subjects. The practice of open data is to enable the reproducibility of results, and to ensure the unrestricted transparency of the results of the published research, without requiring the identity of research subjects.
