

**MANAGEMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS:
What is the Anthropological way out for Organizational Psychology?**

Harrysson Luiz da Silva

PostDoctorate Professor of the Geosciences Department at the Federal University (UFSC) in Florianopolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil and at the Generation of Knowledge Technologies Institute (Kw) in Florianopolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil.

E-mail: harrysson@uol.com.br

Ana Elisabeth Moiseichyk

Doctorate Professor of the Administration Department at the Federal University (UFSC) in Santa Maria, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil

E-mail: anamoiseichyk@hotmail.com

Rosemy da Silva Nascimento

Doctorate Professor of the Geosciences Department at the Federal University (UFSC) in Florianopolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil

E-mail: rosemy.nascimento@gmail.com

Erico Porto Filho

PHD student of the PostGraduate Program in Geography at the Federal University and MSc Professor of the Geosciences Department at the Federal University (UFSC) in Florianopolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil

E-mail: ericoportofilho@uol.com.br

Luciana da Veiga Cascaes

Master of Production Engineering at the Federal University (UFSC) in Florianopolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil

E-mail: luciana-cascaes@yahoo.com.br

ABSTRACT

This communication is a result of a research done in the Production Engineering Post Graduation Course. It aims at analyzing the understanding of the late XX century authors as for an impasse in the administration of relationship among people and organizations. One must highlight the advance provided by Jean Francois Chanlat as to the need of a new anthropology for the organizations. The groundwork adopted is based on the philosophical anthropology that underlies the Administration Colleges. Chanlat's proposal analysis leads to ascertain that at the same time that he points out the need of a new anthropology he makes use of an anthropology based on the disciplines to explain the human phenomena in the organizations. This prevents him from reaching his own objective.

Keywords: Conflict Management, Organizations, Anthropology, Organizational Psychology

1. INTRODUCTION

The history of business management is a topic that has been discussed since the XX century in the 40s by Taylor and Ford, the "Scientific Administration" pioneers. Throughout history authors from different areas of knowledge tried to enhance Taylor's methodologies including Organizational Psychology.

The aim was to reach new knowledge that allowed the organizations to get motivated employees thus increasing productivity and profit. This search achieved its goal in many historical moments through Maslow's theory for instance. But at the same time it was rendered obsolete because it did not meet the reality and the advance of the social organization.

Although Organizational Psychology tried to elucidate this phenomenon it did not succeed. Some authors like Ramos (1989) even questioned the concept of "mental health". He criticized the practice of Individualistic Psychology within organizations but at the same time he inserted it as a necessary discipline for the elucidation and intervention of this phenomenon.

However, Organizational Psychology, Psychology's specialization, that should treat conflicting relations (capital-work) in the organizations as well as its subspecialties, did not make true space as a scientific discipline because it did not set its object of investigation/intervention.

This limitation of Psychology is a consequence of its groundwork being centered on Greek rationality, of an intuitive reasoning that in principle would rule the human being. In turn, the destiny of each worker would have been traced according to the logic of the company he works for. Being so, his actions would not change his future since it had been already settled.

The reasoning myth rescued by Descartes (1987) crystallized like the knowledge of our times. However, the authors of Administration, did not reach the fundamentals of the impasses they found out in the organizations. Only Chanlat (1993, 1996) draws attention to the need of a new anthropology that would bring the human being back to his consistency for the organizations.

The impasses that unfold of the present anthropology, derive from the same anthropology that supports Taylor's theory although it took shape in Behaviorist Psychology. This psychology was neither enough nor necessary for the authors to understand the phenomena under discussion because they all require the rescue of subjectivity although they fall into the Manichaeism Cartesian as they request subjectivity as if subjectivity existed in this world but was not objective.

Chanlat (1993) is based on the same cognitive structure of the understanding of the human phenomenon in the organizations, giving up hope of a solution, even with what he tries to break. On the other hand, he intends that an anthropology is "germinated" from the other disciplines that has the human as object as anthropology is precisely a basic discipline that has to sustain any knowledge about men before being reached by psychological, sociological cutouts, etc, that is, in the discipline area.

Another mistake made by Chanlat (1993) is to glimpse the possibility of an interdiscipline practice respecting the ground of each discipline when in fact, for a scientific interdiscipline practice, the phenomenon in its objective constitution must be respected.

It can be ascertained that there is an impasse in the scientific doing. There is no theory or scientific methodology available neither in Chanlat's hands (1993) nor in the hands of the authors and professionals with whom he works that would allow him to pursue his purpose.

This verification ends with his vision of impossibility of scientific impartiality, to the extent that man would be subject and object of his own science since subject and object are merely functions adopted in a scientific practice. The anthropology required by Chanlat already exists and it is grounded on scientific ontology where man is an inseparable part of the world. Before anything else it is necessary to understand which are the bases of ontology that provides man the basis. However because of didactic limitations we will not be able to expose now the ontology that gives bases to a scientific anthropology in organizations.

This scientific anthropology will give us the bases to a scientific theory of personality, therefore the bases for a Scientific Psychology in any of its subspecialties and also regarding Psychology of Organizations.

There follows an analysis of some of the authors that have been treating organizational conflicts and their analytical perspectives about the management process of organizational conflicts.

2. THE FOUNDATION OF ADMINISTRATION: Taylor, Ford and other authors

2.1 The foundation of Administration: Taylor and Ford

After the Industrial Revolution and the technological advance there was a change in the social-historical context of that time that came to implement new production relations and a new way of production, called capitalist. The objective occurrence of this new historical context roused the need of scientific understanding from the scientific method developed by Frederick Winslow Taylor (1856-1915), engineer, founder of Scientific Administration that established the Scientific Administration School. This School aimed at eliminating the waste and increasing productivity of the organizations through the efficient maximization of the workers.

Consequently a more systematic structure of organizational management started to be outlined combining military and engineering principles. Basically "Taylor separated "mental work", that would be the managers' responsibility, from "physical work", that would be the workers' responsibility". Chiavenato (1978,1999) highlights that the separation devised by Taylor already contained on its conceptual bases the Cartesian duality mind-body thus separating the notion of knowledge, that is, the tacit knowledge from the explicit knowledge.

According to the principle of management of organizational conflicts, the management should replace the empiricism of the manufacturing operations with methodologies based on scientific procedures. Therefore the tasks performed by the workers should be analyzed, decomposing them into elementary movements and establishing a more efficient methodology to develop them.

The control of the activities was conducted to ensure compliance with the standards established by the planning in performing the tasks always seeking to correct, improve and reward levels of efficiency and productivity achieved.

Lately this process is known as PCP – Planning and Production Control. Lastly, the management should distribute the tasks of each worker of the manufacturing process and give him responsibility in accordance with the principle of performance.

As a result it is established a division of labor in the organizations in terms of manufacturing process as each worker performs only one predominant task in a repetitive way predetermined by the manager. Hence the worker becomes more and more specialized as he develops only part of the total work. This resulted in an increase in productivity and a control of each worker's performance.

As opposed to the craftsman, the specialized worker "knows" how to perform the task without implying a "knowledge" that results from the task performed and his function relations in the total production process.

The worker's "motivation", according to Taylor, would be a consequence of the material reward gained due to the increase in productivity. Based on the concept of "homo economicus", the Scientific Administration establishes that the worker's payment must be related to his productivity for him to develop the maximum of production he is physically capable of. According to Chiavenato (1999), the worker was seen by Taylor as someone "limited and mean, lazy and guilty of his vagrancy and waste of the organizations and that he should be controlled by means of rational work and standard time".

Man is motivated to work because he fears hunger and needs money to live. Being so, the wage reward and production award (wage based on production) influenced individual efforts at work, Chiavenato (1999). Thus the School of Scientific Administration translated the administration of organizations as if they were machines where the workers were just a piece of machinery. It should be emphasized that the fundamentals of conflicts of all Schools of Administration arise from its theoretical and methodological model of planning and production control.

2.2 The understanding of Management of Organizational Conflicts according to Guerreiro Ramos

What stands out in Ramos' work (1989), "The new science of organizations", is that he considered the scientific view of Taylor's capitalism as traditional, linked to the men who are part of it. He tries to identify the epistemology inherent in the social science that supports the theory of organizations, making clear that this established social science sustains itself on a rational characteristic of the mercantile system. Therefore the market is the basis of objectivity.

Ramos (1989) rescues the rationalism and the rational intuition acting in a deterministic way on reality, bringing the distinctions between good and evil, whose reality hindered the reduction to a historical or social phenomenon since there was human dimension. Because of the western culture strong reasoning what was done was to make it compatible with society's modern normative structure bringing together the process of society being institutionalized and human nature being ignored. Concomitantly, Ramos (1989) makes reference to Max Weber and his rejection of historical determinism.

"Max Weber is described, frequently, as a great believer in the insufficiently qualified excellence of logic inherent in society centered on market." (pg 4)

In his turn, Ramos (1989) indicated in his work the need of psychological work in the organization. For him, scientific psychology supported itself on the behavioral psychology perspective that is absolutely incompatible with the scientific objectives intended by the author.

Therefore, since an anthropological perspective is incompatible with the process of "anti-institution" he places the "integration ideology" sustained by a holistic approach as an alternative in the relation of dependence on the parts over the whole. So Ramos (1980) states that the participation of psychologists in the organization is necessary as long as they do not have an individualistic view which goes against to what is specific to the organizational phenomenon.

“Besides one can ascertain that the imprecise concept of organizational sanity derives from a single root : the inappropriate collocation of the concept of mental sanity. If mental health is a valid concept, its patterns are only applicable to individuals. They cannot ever be applicable to organizations or deduced from organizational situations. The concept of organizational sanity is directly related to the psychology of adjustment and does not recognize individual autonomy.” (pg 78)

Throughout his work, Ramos (1989) was the only author that came close to the problematic concept of mental sanity, a distinct attitude compared to the other authors who only criticize the results, though he did not draw any inferences from the existing definition based on rationality that produces such results. Similarly he identified the limitations of the fundamentals of conceptions of Taylor’s models pointing out the need of a psychology with a theory substantiated on effective scientific principles. Thus Ramos (1989) started a preliminary draft without treating directly the management of organizational conflicts.

This situation leads to the impasses of the concept of mental sanity and the need of breaking this deadlock so that another model of management can be achieved thus overcoming obstacles. The problem is that the holistic psychology he proposes as a solution does not follow the scientific principles that he himself proclaimed hence not making the management of organizational conflicts possible.

2.3 The understanding of Management of Organizational Conflicts according to Ricardo Semler

Semler’s perspective in his best-seller “Turning your own table upside down” is based on his own personal experience, therefore an empirical comprehension of his history and the obstacles he had faced and overcome since his school days.

Recently the same comprehension was revisited through ontopsychology (perspective that discharges science and addresses to the “intuition” of the businessman the administration and success of the company). Semler describes a series of learning processes throughout his life showing that at many times he was mistaken when selecting the instruments to achieve success due to his anxiety for conquest. Typical procedure based on intuition without the worry with the objective occurrences that define an investigation phenomenon.

This traditional model of management of organizational conflicts presented results at a certain historical period in which the industry development with repetitive tasks demanded a model of management that administered this complex structure within which were inserted the human beings.

This model of management is based on a bureaucratic structure which is traditional until these days. It reduces man to a mere resource among others in the organization. A perspective where despotism and the intuition of equivalence between the effort you invest and the result you get. As the intuition unfolds it takes us to an exacerbation of the productivity demand without taking the human aspect into consideration except for the administrative level. In this perspective we also find a search for results in the short run that most of the times generates more serious problems in the long run.

Despite all the theoretical discussions and developed methodologies there is still a lack of instruments to deal with the dimension of the human being since he has been motivated to be more productive in many different ways. Therefore motivation bears no relation to hierarchy, bureaucracy, the excess of demands at work and so little exchange offered. It is determined exclusively by a financial matter, that is, the wage earned. This is another perspective that arises in the business world.

Nowadays we talk about intellectual capital, a concept that has never been discussed before due to the historical conditions of the times when the priority was to have workers that could operate machines performing repetitive actions.

According to Nonaka and Takeuchi (1997) intellectual capital is a new resource for this new professional, resulting from a continuous renewal process of the basis of his knowledge. The apparatus of conclusions, insights and guesses that reflect subjective judgments is an integral part of knowledge also covering values, ideals and emotions.

The organization is not able to generate knowledge without the individuals, hence it must back up creative individuals as well as provide them with contexts for creation of knowledge. The creation of organizational knowledge must be understood as a process that expands organizationally the knowledge created by individuals crystallizing it as part of the network of knowledge of the organization.

2.4 The understanding of Management of Organizational Conflicts according to Peter Senge

Senge (1990) stands out in the last decade of the XX century with the proposal of “learning organizations”. They would be based on five disciplines (1), proposing an anthropology and a company conception totally new and fundamentally contrary to Taylor’s view which remains until the present time.

“The learning organizations are organizations whose management model has as an objective to meet material need, own respect and the fulfillment of the employees. In the author’s opinion this must be the aim of all organizations.” (pg.136)

Senge (1990) states that the effort to see the whole, adding fragments, is useless and will not provide the intended view. The proposal of the book “The Fifth Discipline” is exactly to disassemble the idea that “the world would be composed of separate forces” which would not relate to one another.

“Getting rid of this illusion we can then form “learning organizations” in which people continuously expand their capacity of creating the results they really want ,where new and high reasoning standards emerge and collective aspiration is set free and where people continuously learn to learn in groups.” (pg.11)

The proposal of group work is based on the idea of “cohesive group” where there is trust and where everybody is united by a “common goal”. It is in a group that one learns to get the best results.

The five disciplines are: personal control, mental models, “common objectives”, learning in group and systemic reasoning. They are concepts he uses not as scientific disciplines but of rationality and behavior with diffuse fundamentals.

Taking into consideration that business and any other kind of work are systems, Senge (1990) adopts the systemic thinking as the fundamental of his comprehension of the organizations. From this perspective, organizations are long term interconnected groups developing function relations which must be studied, observed and understood without segregating them having in mind to observe each part of it so that you can have control over all.

“Systematic reasoning is the fifth discipline as it is the discipline that integrates the other four merging them into a coherent group in theory and practice avoiding them to be seen in isolation as simple tricks or fads to make changes in the organization.” (pg.21)

It is appropriate to stand out that the comprehension of the systemic reasoning developed by Senge is the same as in Systemic Psychotherapy. The systemic perspective emphasizes an overall vision and the inter-discipline approach although in the discourse it is proposed to achieve the phenomenon in its totality. Thus it does not make its object clear and if there is no solid scientific theory of personality, it is not scientific, ending up in a holistic approach. This condition does not help overcome the problem effectively as it is not a phenomenon, that is, it is not scientifically based on phenomenon components.

However, Senge (1990) draws attention to the illusion that the faster the bigger the growth, the gains, the profit and the support, stating that “cause and effect” are not intimately related in time and space ,raising here a reflection on our way of thinking and acting. It shows that minor actions may cause major effective and durable consequences for the organization. But many times they are not visualized since in order to detect them it is necessary a phenomenon perspective of the organizational structures.

It is necessary to contemplate that when one works with cause and effect one is isolating a variable that would be the only responsible for the production of a certain effect, therefore a deterministic comprehension, that is on the basis of metaphysics. This is because human reality imposes itself on contiguous phenomena, that is, a set of occurrences with articulated functions, with different weight, implying a group of scientific disciplines. This understanding of phenomenon respects the verifications found in human reality. Therefore, they are scientific, contrary to the causative notion.

One should not look for the reasons that support the explanations but for the occurrences that lead us to the understanding of the phenomena and their function relations. A moral solution is not more than a solution sustained by subjectivity since it is based on the personal values of the person who intervenes. Instead,a scientific solution implies a whole theoretical scientific apparatus and a methodology that makes the scientific praxis possible, always having the control of the results through scientific predictions.

2.5 The Comprehension of Management of Organizational Conflicts according to Peter Drucker

Drucker (1981, 2002) when writing about “The Human Factor and Performance” rescues the human resources within the capitalist perspective whose main idea has always been capital and profit. However, he makes clear the impossibility of achievement of the businessmen objectives as far as capital productivity and the better use of natural resources, without considering the human resources which are inevitably implied in the organization results.

The author criticizes what is called “human organization administration” as an accomplishment of a mechanistic management, a view that is limited to hiring, demands of work, tasks and administrative procedures, including training. Concomitantly it is ascertained that none of the Human Resource Schools proposed the study and the implementation of a system in search of men’s satisfaction within the organization as it could imply a change in the organizational structures.

Drucker (1981) notes that there were no advances in terms of new contributions. He also realized that the same occurs in more specialized disciplines such as: industrial anthropology, industrial sociology, industrial psychology, all of them based on industrial relations.

“The big advance occurred when the United States faced the perspective above mentioned, that is, that human nature was being ignored and fragmented. They then searched a divergent conception, where the human conception would demand distinct and explicit tools being essential to break down the belief of motivation through fear thus allowing a spontaneous motivation to emerge as soon as fear was eliminated.” (pg.280)

According to Drucker (1981), since the First World War, the process of personnel administration with all these connotations, included: recruitment and selection of personnel, training and payment depending on productivity. All these have been in practice for the last fifty years and still is nowadays.

Implicit in this rationality is the view that work is a punishment and that people must obey and submit themselves and getting satisfaction would not depend on their own but on something else.

Even though knowledge and science have advanced one still maintains the social sciences perspective of Middle Ages as a dissociation between planning and activities performance, that is, among investigation, intervention and evaluation takes place.

However, due to technology evolution and the change of performance of tasks merely repetitive and of routine with the manipulation of machines and materials, this view of management becomes incompatible with effective organizational reality.

The scientific administration proposed by Taylor would be inadequate and above all make losses as it fragmented reality into little pieces that could not be assembled to reach a global and total sight of this phenomenon.

Human sciences were historically composed based on a rationality apart from scientific knowledge production. This condition leads to one of the biggest problems that is to do science from human phenomenon and mainly to understand the human phenomenon in the organizational field and the relations with respective conflicts.

3. CHANLAT AND THE DEMAND FOR A NEW ANTHROPOLOGY FOR THE ORGANIZATIONS

Chanlat (1993) refutes the criticism exposed by the authors mentioned above. However, he goes further when he states that a new anthropology for the organizations is necessary but one that promoted the rescue of human dimension that is lost in the organizational context.

According to Chanlat (1993) despite the high level of sophistication of the researches in the administration area, it is noted the lack of researches in other areas (economy, psychology and sociology) that could clarify the human factor as a central, functional and indispensable element of the organizational development process.

Therefore, neither the Administration science nor the other areas of knowledge in their respective discipline demarcation managed to effectively generate a contribution to the understanding of human phenomenon in the organizational context.

According to Chanlat (1993) the passive adoption of the physical sciences to understand men makes it unable to make any effective contribution to understand the meaning that people give to their lives in the organizations.

To advance in an objective understanding of interpersonal relationship in the organizations, a new anthropology is necessary for the organizations. This means that without this possibility it will not be possible to establish an intervention process that controls the results in the process of management of organizational conflicts, considering the individual as a central focus that belongs to it and that constitutes it.

Chanlat (1993) states that it is necessary to understand the employee as to his wishes when faced with the professional activities and their function in his being. To achieve such aim he makes use of human sciences pointing out that the major difficulty of this option lies in not falling into the trap of “juxtaposition of disciplines” that contributes to stress an impression of confusion.

Being so, human resources, organizational psychology, within other areas of knowledge is a set of patches of so many disciplines and distinct perspectives on which organizations rely on disjointedly, hence, in a fragmented way, seeking the resolution of impasses in an isolated way.

From this perspective, according to Chanlat, any attempt of discipline investigation or intervention to solve an organizational problem, that is interdisciplinary by its very nature, would not have any function in the solution of non-conformity found in the relations among individuals in the organizations.

What is effectively observed in Chanlat (1993) is that he is trying to find a way to understand the human being, considering its uniqueness without discarding the material context in which he is inserted, therefore, in time and space. So he stands out men in his set of profiles and their functions, that is, in the totality of the essence of men.

(...) “this generic being always incarnates in a concrete being: half woman, adult, child, father, husband, teacher, executive, peasant, African and occidental. It is this singular existence in the world that makes him a specific being. That is, this abstract man exists as a representation and an intellectual category. In return he always shows in the daily reality in a particular concrete way, in a real situation. Everybody has at the same time the generic and the specific. The phenomena which are studied reflect beyond any doubt these two reality arrangements. Therefore the study of the human factor in the organizations cannot dissociate this double dependence.” (pg.28)

Chanlat (1933) is expressly seeking a rupture with a perspective that reduces man to a level of material creation where he is converted into an amorphous mass of substance that can be manipulated.

However, man is above all a being moved by desire, therefore by the future. He cannot be understood if he is restricted to his professional profile or as being independent of his effective context.

Chanlat (1993) also searches for Christophe Dejours’ contribution to a new view of human suffering in the organizations. One of Dejours’ objective is to measure the paradox of production targets. Externally it is viewed as a promise of happiness whereas internally it is viewed as a synonym of unhappiness although he stands out that work cannot only be a source of unhappiness but also of feasibility and pleasure. It is within this horizon that the author proposes the use of this new emergent discipline named “psychopathology of work”, according to Castro (2001). The use of these concepts built by Freud such as psychoneurosis and of concepts created and used by other authors who had access to knowledge produced at the end of the XIX century, beginning of the XX century.

Therefore, at a certain historic time in which science was not still at its peak, fundamentally as far as the humanities are concerned, it is extremely compromising when we talk about the XXI century. Precisely, in the concept and designation of traumatic neurosis, it becomes evident the imprisonment within a rationalist perspective, Cartesian, where everything is remitted to the interior of the individual, the personality being a psychological process that occurs inside your mind. So we are back to the starting point again.

At last, to refer to this psychology is exactly to derail Chanlat’s (1993) central objective as he tries to clarify and rescue the human factor in the organizations. How could that be possible through a psychology and an anthropology that remits all the complications faced by man as processes occurring inside his mind?

How to make Chanlat’s view compatible with the search for man’s rescue as a whole being ,in a set of profiles ? As he defends this need he is defending the worker, professional, father, son, husband, brother, a being that is singular and universal.

Hence, someone inserted inside a universe of other human beings , in his material and professional contingency ,having bills to pay at the end of the month, having to deal with coworkers ,reacting to them, confronting a given

management system, with productive and efficiency demands, in a threatening labor market, taking the risk of being substituted. Would he be indeed someone independent of this context?

It is exactly where we look for the way out that we find the starting point as to the problem we propose to overcome. To find the solution in a rationalist perspective of psychology, anthropology and ontology is to condemn yourself to get stuck in a vicious circle. This way we send the world, the objective reality, inside men's mind, leaving reality at the mercy of someone's interpretation.

However, Chanlat (1993) is mistaken when he tries to understand human subjectivity making use of psychoanalysis because this way he is making use of anthropology underlying this discipline, without which it would not be sustained. It is this current anthropology built on the foundation of western civilization, based on reasoning, therefore rationalist, without realistic support, that always resorts to infinity through a discourse without anchorage in historical materialism. Therefore, all the anthropology that provides a basis for psychoanalysis is the same that provides a basis for all the schools of administration that cannot handle the human conflicts in the organizations and through which Chanlat criticizes and looks for a way out.

So, even though new anthropologies are searched, to start from what is already on the basis of disciplines being applied, to bring a rationalist underlying anthropology is the same way created for the conditions of possibilities of the limitations of the organizations that intends to combat and overcome the dimension of the human. Thus both psychoanalysis and interdisciplines are not pointed as ways to a new anthropology for the organizations since Chanlat (1999) does not have a scientific understanding of science when he defines:

“The big difference between the physical-chemical sciences and the humanities resides exactly in the fact that in the last ones human being is at the same time the object and the subject of his science.” (pg.32)

The purpose is to seek a scientific anthropology that allows the elucidation of man becoming objective in time and space, a singular being with several profiles that must be understood as a concrete man in its totality in the world as we will see below.

4. THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL BASES FOR A SCIENTIFIC THEORY OF PERSONALITY

Before all previously made considerations, which would be the way out for a new anthropology for the organizations? All authors that have been analyzed here remain retained in their own space-temporal dimension of analysis, situated within the same analytical perspective looking for a way out inside the same rationale.

The path indicated does not derive from anthropology but of an ontology that offers bases for a scientific anthropology. Even so, it would be necessary to verify among the existing oncology which one would definitely respond to the demand of a new anthropology for the organizations.

Therefore, the first step would be to identify on which ontology the analytical perspectives of the authors analyzed were based in relation to the demand of a new perspective that pointed at a new scientific anthropology.

So a scientific ontology would result in a scientific anthropology and consequently a personality theory that would allow to establish an objective understanding of the management of organizational conflicts.

The first issue to be clarified when we take these ambiguities into consideration would be to make clear the existence of a “Consciousness” that precedes the “I” as an initial principle and to consider that the thought is the second in terms of oncology and not the opposite. None of the authors mentioned here had the privilege of finding a way out for the human phenomenon in the field of organizational psychology previously described in the administration area.

In order to start from this comprehension it would be necessary to elucidate the different ontology that supports the different perspectives of organizational psychology in the face of dialectical ontology that provides scientific bases for a scientific anthropology and therefore, for a scientific theory of the personality of the human phenomenon in the organizations.

But we believe it enough and necessary until the present time that the simple fact of pointing at this degree of difficulty, in the face of an existing ontology, guarantees the administrators, the possibility that it is feasible to manage the human phenomenon conflicts in the organizations in their different perspectives.

As to consciousness: there is the thoughtless consciousness that is a possibility condition to any other consciousness. Every consciousness is the relation that we establish with objects, an event. It firstly happens as a thoughtless consciousness that is different from unconscious.

The condition of possibility for the human being to constitute himself in an essence, in a singularity included in a series of human beings, is to exist. The spontaneous behaviors are only an indicative of this. When we reach someone in a certain profile, professional, for example, we reach him concretely. There is an opacity among the profiles so that there is no way they can be transparent to each other since it cannot show in all profiles. The person does not reduce himself to the knowledge we have about him, but it is not anything else than this.

Freedom is ontological. There is always a choice on its base. You can always say no. What matters is the price, the mutilation that a human suffers when he does not realize his being. Freedom implies a materialism. It is always a psychophysical being, with a history, that is in a certain point in time and space in the face of a structure of choices that imposes him a certain field of possibilities. To be free is to be in movement and to choose the direction of this movement. Man is free as he is in the world and therefore he cannot escape from materialism, because it makes him choose, according to Sartre (1987).

“However, if existence really precedes essence, man is responsible for what he is. (...) when we claim that man chooses himself, we want to say that each one of us chooses ourselves, but we also want to say that by choosing ourselves, we choose all men. In fact, there is no single act of ours, that creating the man we want to be, is not creating simultaneously an image of the man as we believe he should be.” (pg 6)

Ultimately, it is necessary to understand that before understanding the psychological organizational processes it is necessary to verify that before them there is correlated an ontology that determines specific anthropology and psychology. And that in each case, we will have different men and types of relations in function of the different comprehension of the world. This is the human and organizational drama.

So, to admit there is a thoughtless consciousness as a possibility condition of any other consciousness, is the first step for the support of an anthropology that will provide concrete bases for a scientific comprehension of a personality theory and therefore to rescue the understanding of individuals in the organizations.

Reflection, perception and imagination are “phenomena of being” but they are not reduced to that. They are coextensive to the “being of the phenomenon”, the thoughtless, implying in a trans-phenomenon dimension. The condition of possibility in order to occur reflection, perception or imagination is to be body and consciousness (thoughtless). To be in time and space, is an ontological condition that makes the anthropological viable and therefore the psychological, according to Sartre (1947, 1965, 1986, 1987 and 1997).

Thus, the thoughtless consciousness is the consciousness that has not or is not being taken as object by another reflective consciousness. The reflected consciousness is the consciousness that has already been taken as object, has already been taken as one’s own, therefore it is “my” consciousness while the thoughtless consciousness is not “mine”, it is impersonal, because it has not been totalized by me. There is also the consciousness that takes another consciousness as object.

Having in mind the so many different levels of consciousness, to take a position in the face of their relation objects is what turns possible to promote the management of conflicts, investigate conflicts and verify the fundamentals that support the relation conflicts in the organizations.

In the existentialist concept of psychological complications, schizophrenia is a complication of the human being, resulting from his life of relations and not from mental processes, that leads him to a material situation, objective of the division of his being, experiencing himself in the world facing two effective possibilities of being. This comprehension is totally different than the psychiatric one because it breaks the notion of mental illness, according to Szasz (1975, 1978, 1980, and 1994).

An organizational conflict is always a problem of impasse of a “psychophysical appropriation” of “experimentation of being” in the companies’ environment. In the most extreme situations of psychological problems there is no loss of consciousness. There is a disruption of personality, being the personality an objective phenomenon of being. There is a psychophysical dynamism that we cannot alter through goodwill or positive thought. It is necessary a process of alteration of personality.

Hence, all the psychotherapeutic process for the resolution of organizational conflicts in an effective way, with control of results, would have to effectively start from a phenomenon ontology that would scientifically restore the consciousness as a fundament of anthropology and of a scientific psychology within the organizational scope.

CONCLUSIONS

It has been ascertained that the basic impasse of the authors from the areas of organizational management is essentially at the level of lack of support of its scientific investigation practice and the implications arising out of its intervention processes in the solution of the problems in the management of organizational conflicts.

This means that it is not still clear in the university environment, what is science and production of scientific knowledge: since there is already a scientific understanding or the phenomenon understanding of production of knowledge, an empiric understanding of science based on experiences and a metaphysics understanding of science supported on the myth of reason. The same occurs in methodological terms where there is no didactic boundary between research methodology, scientific methodology and the presentation of research methodology.

This occurrence is easily understood since this phenomenon is part of the knowledge of our times, that is the Cartesian rationality, supported in principle on a reason, a reason on which all the authors of the administration area are still based on having not overcome it objectively yet.

However, it is made explicit that for a change in the analytical perspective of the relationship conflicts in the organizations, it is not enough to create new methodologies or develop new logical models as Engineering and Administration usually do.

On the one hand, it is observed that on the base of rationality of the authors here analyzed, the myth of reason and a struggle between a psychology that ignores human nature as it bases itself basically on behavior, expatriating man from his being, as long as he is taken merely as a resource, among others that the organizations have.

On the other hand, a subjective psychology circumscribed within the myth of reason, having in mind that all schools of psychology, except for behaviorism, are based on psychoanalysis, where the myth of reason, or the prime reason that moves us becomes objective by the unconsciousness.

In the same way, these have been the alternatives until the present time, which authors that work and research in this area have found but did not develop.

The history of Management of Organizations that started with an express view of Engineering, through Taylor and Ford's background and considering the social-historical context that resulted from the Industrial Revolution, is based on mythology and empiricism. In this perspective, the individuals would have to serve as "secondary parts" to allow for the best performance of the machinery, or, translating, the main responsible for productivity, although such responsibility was not recognized in the same way. This is the reason why the historical moment and engineering background was emphasized.

However, a more strict position, would show that the problems repeat themselves in similar contexts, exactly because the situation was not identified as a phenomenon. It is verified throughout this work the authors converging on a rationalist perspective, a disruption that must take place otherwise the way out for organizational impasses will never be found.

Based on these verifications, the disciplines implied in the phenomenon of management of organizations: the future will be a repetition of the past, through the reproduction of rationality, of capitalism and of the organizational conflicts. That is to say, new theories declaring "magical solutions".

To rescue this human dimension forgotten in the organizations, it is necessary to rescue first a dimension even more remote in the area of humanities that is scientific practice, which has been relegated both in the history of organizations and in the history of humanities.

It has been made explicit that the conditions of possibility of someone being affected cannot be explained since he is inserted in a certain atmosphere. This atmosphere, in the case of organizations, is composed of the effective occurrences of the organization and therefore demands an identification of the elements that composes it.

All the structure and rationality of the organizations that evaluated the possibilities of dealing with these occurrences must be identified, starting from the study of the organization phenomenon. Thus a scientific

methodology will be developed and that will result in an intervention that will provide the necessary changes with control and prediction of results.

The path here made succinctly tried to make explicit the supporting pillars that are missing in the organizations, showing the need to start from an ontology that supports the anthropology which will in return provide the bases for a psychology, sociology, etc. All this path was historically consolidated by the organizations in a mistaken way circumscribed in a mythic and subjective rationality.

This work elucidates that it is possible to revert the impasses since this rationality is altered, being left behind all the work to be done maintaining this new rationality thus making the scientific practice possible when dealing with Organizations.

There is no way to overcome the organizational impasses as far as the human, motivation, human relations are concerned if the General Theory of Administration is not rewritten in the light of this scientific anthropology. In order to make it possible it is necessary to review the fundamentals of the ontological, anthropological and psychological bases and epistemology of the General Theory of Administration to guarantee with control of results the comprehension of all companies phenomena among them the relations conflicts in the organizations.

Being so, reviewing the fundamentals of the General Theory of Administration implies that all correlative disciplines which have the function of relation with Administration must also have their fundamentals reviewed otherwise the understanding of the different profiles of relation with the field of management of organizations will not be achieved.

The so called transdiscipline and multidiscipline have a negative impact on the relations conflicts in the organizations because they present themselves as methodological perspectives to the elucidation of the relations phenomena when in truth they present problems due to the absence of scientific bases.

Therefore, when facing the phenomenon or scientific comprehension there is no way any support merely empirical, metaphysical, logical, can guarantee the control of results, the solution of any conflict, be it of business, environmental, educational, politic territorial, economic- financial, psychological / psychopathological of production of knowledge.

In order to choose from existing choices, the achievement of proposed objectives must be taken into consideration, when discussing the bases that revisit the fundamentals of not only the relations conflicts of organizations but also all the General Theory of Administration, when pointing at a possible anthropology for the elucidation of the relations conflicts in the organizations.

The advance in relation to Chanlat is evident when it is shown that it is not enough to change anthropology but above all it is necessary to verify the ontology that underlines all anthropology, as a way out to the solutions of human conflicts in the organizations, taking the opposite way pointed by psychoanalysis.

If researchers of business management are spatially in the world of globalization of financial markets, of transactions via e-commerce, of biotechnology, of nanotechnology, why is it then that in terms of relations conflicts they still maintain temporal processes of management in the XV century ontology and anthropology? The answer to this question seems to be the permanent need of maintenance of the absolute knowledge of being of the individuals in a perspective of the future that has already been determined with implications in the present.

Thus, metaphysical perspectives, like onto psychology have recently been mentioned as proposals of solution of the problems of the discipline of psychology in the companies, as they guarantee that science could not prove that materialism constitutes mundane reality pointing out that science must be substituted for intuition.

It seems that we are in a magic period in time when the solution to the problems is found through distant actions, via diverse mechanisms, among them business spirituality, where the problem lies in the soul of the company, not in the objective occurrences, that support the relations among companies and among their members.

Because there is no scientific reevaluation of the fundamentals applied, one must demarcate the objects of investigation. There is no way to guarantee that only scientific comprehension is likely to become a path for the intervention with control of results of relation problems in the organizations. This is still a path to be overcome. Nowadays we still live a historical moment in which to develop science and produce scientific knowledge is getting more and more difficult. This is so because the systematic doubt resource, the search for the infinite, the

immeasurable, the intangible and magic, consubstantiate as the basic principles of the scientific rationality of the XXI century, not only in the field of the organizations but also in all research sectors “so called” scientific. We do not work with discipline demarcation, object definition, theory and methodology. Any way that leads to some result, even without control, is taken as liable to be an object of a scientific research.

The outcome of all this exposition shows the need of continuity of a work that aims at distinguishing the different kinds of knowledge and their objective implications in their respective fields of discipline and not support objective occurrences related to relation conflicts in other didactic demarcation and fundamentals of ontology that do not correspond to the nature of the phenomena here described.

Above all, we cannot forget that all these implications have a psychophysical function that may complicate the dynamics of personality of many people and their future in the organizations, in terms of possibilities of viability of being and their projects and desires of being. In practical terms, it is still very distant for administrators to admit that the conflicts in the organizations have origin on the ontology that supports the objective reality of the daily activities of companies and institutions. There is still a long theoretical, academic and professional way to follow in this direction. The major change that should happen, is to make these individuals that are in the activities of business management, change their cognitive methods of structure of relations in which the companies are organized so that the management of organizational conflicts can be viable.

REFERENCES

- CASTRO, Fernando Gastal. The problematic of the definition of psyche in the researches of Wanderley Codo and collaborators about psychological distress at work. Florianopolis, 2001, Dissertation, Postgraduation Program in Psychology, Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil.
- CHANLAT, Jean-Francois. The individual in the organization - forgotten dimensions. Vol I. 3rd edition. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Atlas Publisher, 1996.
- _____. The individual in the organization - forgotten dimensions. Vol II. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Atlas Publisher, 1993.
- _____. The individual in the organization - forgotten dimensions. Vol III. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Atlas Publisher, 1996.
- _____. Social Sciences and Management - reconciling the economic and the social. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Atlas Publisher, 1999
- CHIAVENATO, Idalberto. Introduction to the General Theory of Administration. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Campus Publisher, 1978
- _____. Personnel Management. 14th edition. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Campus Publisher, 1999.
- DESCARTES, Rene. Method Discourse; the soul passions. 4th edition. Vol I. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Nova Cultural Publisher, 1987.
- DRUCKER, Peter. Human Factor and Performance. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Pioneira Publisher, 1981.
- _____. Administration in the next society. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Nobel Publisher, 2002.
- NONAKA I. & TAKEUCHI, H. Creation of knowledge in the company. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Campus Publisher, 1997
- RAMOS, Alberto Guerreiro. The new science of Organizations -reconceptualizing the wealth of nations. 2nd edition. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Fundacao Getulio Vargas Publisher, 1989.
- SARTRE, Jean Paul. Situations I. Lisbon, Portugal: Gallimard, 1947.
- _____. A sketch of a theory of emotions. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Zahar Publishers, 1965.
- _____. Satre in Brazil –the conference in Araraquara. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Paz e Terra Publisher- Unesp, 1986.
- _____. The thinkers. 3rd edition. São Paulo, Brazil: Nova Cultural Publisher, 1987.
- _____. The being and nothingness. The practice of phenomena ontology. Petropolis, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Vozes, 1997
- SENGER, Peter. The fifth discipline. São Paulo, Brazil: Best Seller Publisher, 1990.
- SEMLER, Ricardo. Turning your own table upside down. 49th edition. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Best Seller Publisher, 1988.
- SZASZ, Thomas S. The ethics of Psychoanalysis - theory and method of autonomous psychotherapy. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Zahar Publishers, 1975.
- _____. The manufacture of madness - a comparative study between The Inquisition and the movement of Mental Health. 2nd edition. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Zahar Publishers, 1978- A.
- _____. Schizophrenia - the sacred symbol of psychiatry. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Zahar Publishers, 1978-B.
- _____. The Myth of Mental Illness. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Zahar Publishers.
- _____. Ideology and Mental Illness. 2nd edition. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Zahar Publishers, 1980
- _____. Psychiatric Slavery. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Nova Fronteira, 1986.
- _____. Cruel Compassion. Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil: Papirus, 1994