CADERNOS EBAPE.BR

FGV EBAPE

DOSSIER: ANTHROPOCENE AND THE LIKE

Anthropocene, environmental crisis, and cannibal capitalism

Maria Elisabete Pereira dos Santos [1] *
Kleverton Melo de Carvalho [2]
Andréa Cardoso Ventura [1]

* Corresponding Author
[1] Universidade Federal da Bahia (UFBA), Escola de Administração, Salvador, BA, Brazil
[2] Universidade Federal de Sergipe (UFS), Departamento de Administração, São Cristóvão, SE, Brazil

Abstract

This article examines the premise that the concepts of the Anthropocene and the related notions of risk, limit, and resilience – while introducing new elements to the debate on the ongoing environmental and climate crises – reveal theoretical, epistemological, and, above all, political limitations regarding how these crises are addressed. Such limitations stem from the fact that incorporating human activity as a risk factor fosters a certain naturalization of the causes of these crises, expressed in the relativization of risks and boundaries, as well as in a generic, conservative, and functionalist concept of resilience. This study examines theoretical frameworks surrounding the concept of the Anthropocene, highlighting the contributions of Bruno Latour and Nancy Fraser. It argues that these constraints hinder the objective identification of processes and accountabilities behind the crises, thereby impeding the formulation of political strategies aimed at transforming the conditions of production and reproduction of the system. The primary contribution of this work lies in identifying gaps and biases within organizational studies and public policy that reinforce the conservative narrative that the crisis-generating system is inherently capable of resolving them. Theoretical and conceptual ambiguity thus operates as a political mechanism that sustains the reproduction and legitimacy of cannibal capitalism.

Keywords: anthropocene, environmental and climate crises, resilience, cannibal capitalism.

Antropoceno, crise ambiental e capitalismo canibal

Resumo

Este texto discute a tese de que os conceitos de Antropoceno e, de modo associado, de risco, limite e resiliência, ao mesmo tempo que trazem novos elementos ao debate sobre as crises ambiental e climática em curso, apresentam limites teóricos, epistemológicos e, sobretudo, políticos ao equacionamento das referidas crises. Tais limites decorrem do fato de que, à incorporação do homem como fator de risco, associa-se uma certa naturalização das causas das crises, expressa na relativização de riscos e limites e em um conceito genérico, conservador e funcional de resiliência. A reflexão analisa referências teóricas em torno do conceito de Antropoceno, com ênfase nas contribuições de Bruno Latour e Nancy Fraser. Conclui-se que tais limitações dificultam a definição objetiva de processos e responsabilidades sobre as crises, traduzindo-se na dificuldade de construção de estratégias políticas de transformação das condições de produção e reprodução do sistema. A principal contribuição do trabalho consiste na indicação de brechas e vieses, no campo dos estudos das organizações e das políticas públicas, que reproduzem a retórica conservadora de que o sistema produtor das crises é, de *per se*, capaz de superá-las. Assim, a imprecisão teórico-conceitual constitui artifício político que assegura a reprodução e a legitimidade do capitalismo canibal.

Palavras-chave: antropoceno, crises ambiental e do clima, resiliência, capitalismo canibal.

Antropoceno, crisis ambiental y capitalismo caníbal

Resumen

Este texto discute la tesis de que los conceptos de Antropoceno y, de modo asociado, de riesgo, límite y resiliencia, si bien aportan nuevos elementos al debate sobre las crisis ambiental y climática en curso, presentan límites teóricos, epistemológicos y, sobre todo, políticos para el abordaje de dichas crisis. Tales límites se derivan de que a la incorporación del ser humano como factor de riesgo se asocia una cierta naturalización de las causas de las crisis, expresada en la relativización de riesgos y límites y en un concepto genérico, conservador y funcional de resiliencia. La reflexión analiza referentes teóricos en torno al concepto de Antropoceno, con énfasis en las contribuciones de Bruno Latour y Nancy Fraser. Se concluye que estas limitaciones dificultan la definición objetiva de procesos y responsabilidades sobre las crisis, lo que se traduce en la dificultad para construir estrategias políticas de transformación de las condiciones de producción y reproducción del sistema. La principal contribución del trabajo consiste en señalar brechas y sesgos, en el campo de los estudios organizacionales y las políticas públicas, que reproducen la retórica conservadora de que el sistema productor de las crisis es, per se, capaz de superarlas. Así, la imprecisión teórico-conceptual constituye un artificio político que asegura la reproducción y la legitimidad del capitalismo caníbal.

Palabras clave: antropoceno, crisis ambiental y climática, resiliencia, capitalismo caníbal.

Submitted on March 08, 2024 and accepted on July 21, 2026.
[Translated version]
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/1679-395120250040x

INTRODUCTION

This article reflects on the thesis that the concept of the Anthropocene and, in association with it, the concepts of risk, limit, and resilience, while adding new elements to the debate on the ongoing environmental and climate crises, have theoretical, epistemological, and, above all, political limitations when it comes to problematizing and confronting those crises. As with the concept of sustainability, its very generality and imprecision turn the Anthropocene into a device that secures the reproduction and legitimacy of the commodity-producing system. Within this debate, the concepts of risk, limit, and resilience derive from treating both the system and the human being in the abstract as producers of scarcity and threat, thereby exposing their conservative character. Incorporated into and shaped by the discourses of public and private actors, these concepts ultimately conceal the structural causes of the ongoing crises.

The concept of the Anthropocene (*anthropos* – "human" and *ceno* – "new") places us at a historical juncture that brings the classic notions of risk and limit back to the center of the debate (Brum, 2014). The factors producing this state of crisis are clearly not, strictly speaking, the so-called natural events – floods, earthquakes, and plagues – that have fueled countless apocalyptic narratives for millennia. The Anthropocene places us in a context in which the "human being ceases to be a biological agent and becomes a geological force"; it marks the moment when the human being ceases to "fear catastrophe and becomes catastrophe [itself]" (Brum, 2014, para. 1). The fact is that narratives associating human action, in generic terms, with the idea of crisis are becoming increasingly common.

The theoretical framework established by the concept of the Anthropocene spans different historical periods. At what point did human action become responsible for the state of nature? In the Neolithic period, with the end of nomadism and the cultivation of the land? In the late eighteenth century, with the Industrial Revolution? In the first half of the twentieth century, with monopoly capitalism based on fossil fuels? Or with globalization and financialization and their more or less predatory development models? Each historical demarcation points to a different set of causal relationships and, consequently, to distinct theoretical-epistemological and political proposals for addressing the ongoing environmental crisis.

From a historical perspective, it does not seem reasonable to reduce the current environmental crisis, its risks, and its scarcities solely to ongoing climate change. One of the most frequent criticisms of the concept of the Anthropocene concerns its generality and the assumption that human action – humanity, that generic entity, *per se* – is responsible for the more or less reversible damage inflicted on nature. The relationship between society and nature must instead be problematized from a historical perspective.

More specifically, it is necessary to identify the structural elements underlying the so-called environmental and climate crisis and relate them to social formations structured around commodity production and accumulation – that is, to a relationship with nature that we characterize here as cannibalistic (Fraser, 2022). This means situating that relationship within the context of modernity, particularly the twentieth century, when the notions of risk, limit, and resilience took shape and became consolidated, at least as they are currently formulated by certain social stakeholders. At its core, this is a debate about the political character of concepts such as the Anthropocene and its correlates, namely risk, limit, and resilience.

The research consisted of an analysis of theoretical texts, with particular emphasis on the debate surrounding the notion of the Anthropocene and on the theoretical contributions of authors such as Bruno Latour and Nancy Fraser, together with texts that address the environmental and climate crises and their related concepts from a historical perspective. More specifically, this is a critical-interpretive theoretical essay – a well-established genre in the applied social sciences and organization studies – whose contribution is measured not by the comprehensiveness of a systematic review but by the consistency and originality of the argument developed.

This reflection is situated within the critical strand of management studies, particularly approaches that address and engage with environmental issues and public action (Cabacine & Fantinel, 2026; Ergene et al., 2018; Good & Thorpe, 2020). It is therefore directed primarily at researchers in organization studies and public policy who work on topics such as organizational practices, environmental governance, territorial management, organizations, and business, and who often draw on concepts such as the Anthropocene and its correlates without sufficient critical scrutiny (Williams et al., 2025). The gap addressed here lies precisely in these studies: by mobilizing risk, limit, and resilience without problematizing them, they naturalize the causes of the crisis and reinforce the rhetoric that the very system producing it is capable of overcoming it.

Against this assumption, we adopt the concept of "cannibal capitalism" (Fraser, 2022) as the guiding thread of the present analysis. Beyond this introduction, the article is structured as follows. The first section examines the Anthropocene, risk, limit, resilience, and cannibal capitalism, presenting their concepts and historical contexts. The following section discusses the naturalization of the crisis and the functionalization of the concepts under critical examination. Finally, we offer an attempt at a conclusion that underscores the structural character of the crisis.

THE ANTHROPOCENE: RISK, LIMIT, RESILIENCE, AND CANNIBAL CAPITALISM

The association of the Anthropocene with the environmental and climate crises links the concept to risk, limit, and resilience. The first two terms, risk and limit, acquired greater historical specificity and conceptual substance during the twentieth century, particularly with the publication of *Silent Spring* (Carson, 1962) and *The Limits to Growth* (Meadows et al., 1972). These works made increasingly apparent the extent to which capitalism, through its monopolistic and financial expansion, exposed the limits of Enlightenment conceptions of progress and unlimited development. In several respects, those beliefs proved illusory. Attention to elements such as risk, scarcity, environmental threats, and resilience is necessary – yet insufficient – for addressing the environmental and climate crisis.

The relationship between society and nature must be problematized not merely from a geological perspective or as a historical phenomenon of the *longue durée*, but as the outcome of specific social formations. This poses the challenge of overcoming such traditional dualities as society and nature or science and politics (Stengers, 1996, 2000, 2018). Deepening this reflection requires the development of theoretical-epistemological and practical perspectives that transcend the notion of humanity as homogeneous and abstract and instead identify historically circumscribed structural processes that produce degradation, exploitation, expropriation, and domination (Douglas, 1992; Fraser, 2022; Latour, 2018; Luhmann, 1996; Lupton, 1999; Stengers, 2018).

In this regard, the emphasis on a "generic human action" as responsible for the environmental crisis, as formulated through the Anthropocene, diverts attention from crucial factors, including the epistemic crisis of approaches that place society and nature in separate ontological domains; the interests at stake in different forms of appropriation of environmental resources; the unequal impacts of the externalities generated by the environmental and climate crises; and the dynamics of power – the political game – that shape perceptions of environmental risks and limits over time.

Moreover, even within the same historical period, more vulnerable social groups frequently face disproportionate risks, whereas privileged classes and elites have greater access to the resources and conditions needed to mitigate such threats. The critique advanced here of the concept of the Anthropocene does not deny human influence on the transformation of nature. Rather, it calls for a critical and contextualized analysis that accounts for the complexity of the processes and the economic and social forces that produce, drive, and profit from environmental degradation. The ongoing crisis, therefore, cannot be understood as the product of the abstract actions of human beings. It must instead be understood through the particular ways in which the system – the capitalist mode of production in its various forms and strands – appropriates nature (Douglas, 1992; Latour, 2017, 2018; Moore, 2016; Stengers, 2018).

Generalizing approaches based on imprecise concepts conceal the specific determinants of particular social formations and obscure structural relations – socially and territorially circumscribed relations of class, race, gender, and power – that determine who suffers and who benefits from the predatory appropriation of nature. Reflecting on the relationship with nature in the context of capitalist colonial expansion, "[e]nvironmental destruction does not affect everyone in the same way, nor does it erase the social and political destruction already under way" (Ferdinand, 2022, p. 22).

After all, both historically and today, "a double fracture persists between those who fear the ecological storm on the horizon and those to whom the deck of justice was denied long before the first gusts of wind" (Ferdinand, 2022, p. 22). The exploitation and expropriation of nature and labor, which Ferdinand metaphorically represents as a slave ship crossing the seas, make clear the need to situate ourselves in time and space in order to understand the conceptual limits within which we operate when attempting to comprehend the environmental and climate crises.

Analyzing the ongoing crises requires reflection on structural elements at the temporal scale of the system of commodity production and capital accumulation inherent in modernity. At issue is the identification of the processes that have driven the exploitation of nature and environmental degradation. It is in relation to this debate that the concept of the Anthropocene may prove more or less useful (Beck, 1992; Ferdinand, 2022; Latour, 2017, 2018; Lupton, 1999; Moore, 2016; Stengers, 2018). Lupton (1999), for example, contributes to this discussion by constructing a typology of risks that links environmental and social factors: real risks and constructionist perspectives, with the latter taking either weak or strong forms.

Real risks, such as planetary boundaries – climate change, biodiversity loss, alterations in the nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, land-use change, freshwater scarcity, ocean acidification, chemical pollution, and agricultural land use – are objectively measurable and require actions that go beyond what has been characterized as mitigation. Weak constructionism recognizes that even in the case of measurable risks, interpretation and response are influenced by social and cultural factors, including symbolic and phenomenological dimensions that guide decision-making.

After all, what do the environmental and climate crises mean for different territories and different social and natural beings? Strong constructionism, in turn, traces some of the pathways through which risk is historically, socially, and politically constructed. Variables such as class, gender, race, demographic trends, and technological development shape public perceptions, which are frequently disconnected from objective reality. This "parallel vision" emerges within a universe of economic and political relations in which nature is viewed merely as a provider.

Lupton's formulation, like that of Isabelle Stengers (2018), brings the distinctly political dimension of the crisis to the fore. After all, these are choices that generate, or reinforce, limits that are transgressed daily. In many circumstances, the objective is to ensure that economic interests remain untouched. Within this debate, it is always necessary, as Stengers (2018, p. 445) argues, to revisit the assumptions under which we operate by placing "the sciences within politics." This, in turn, requires us to situate politics within theory and within the crises themselves. The proposition of a cosmopolitics may offer a productive path for addressing the aporias between hegemonic universalizations and exclusionary particularisms that the concept of the Anthropocene sometimes suggests – one of the most significant aspects of Stengers's reflection on the politicization of science.

The concept of the Anthropocene, frequently attributed to Crutzen and Stoermer (2000), understands the environmental crisis as a consequence of human action in general and therefore fails to capture the complexity of the factors that define environmental risks and limits. Such an approach disregards the diversity of social formations and their respective relationships between society and nature and, in doing so, minimizes the inequalities that produce vulnerability, thereby constraining the responses required in the present. An approach is needed that acknowledges hegemonic structural relations while also recognizing the diverse models, alternatives, and experiences of organizations and communities (Ferdinand, 2022; Moore, 2016; Stengers, 1996, 2000, 2018).

Let us therefore examine more closely the concepts of risk, limit, and resilience, which are situated in a specific historical period: the twentieth century. In *Silent Spring*, Rachel Carson warned the world in the 1960s that technology – the Enlightenment promise of development and freedom – could poison us all. The idyllic world described in "A Fable for Tomorrow" ultimately collapsed: "There was once a town in the heart of America where all life seemed to live in harmony with its surroundings" (Carson, 1962, p. 10).

Carson draws attention to the negative impact that human creations – from chemical substances produced in laboratories to radiation – inflict on nature and life. She states emphatically: "The people had done it themselves" (Carson, 1962, p. 10). Adding further elements to the problematization of how what would later be understood as the Anthropocene should be dated, she emphasizes that it was in the twentieth century that human action began to have irreversible impacts on nature: "Only within the moment represented by the present century has one species – man – acquired significant power to alter the nature of his world" (Carson, 1962, p. 10).

Even if we question whether the phenomena identified by Carson should be treated as a milestone in the environmental crisis, the concept of risk, which took shape during the 1960s, must be linked to the notion of scarcity that developed over the following decade with the publication of *The Limits to Growth*. At the urging of Aurelio Peccei – the Italian businessman associated with Fiat and Olivetti – academic, political, and business leaders gathered at the Accademia dei Lincei in Rome to discuss the "future of humanity." These meetings gave rise to the Club of Rome (Meadows et al., 1972, p. 9). One outcome of this initiative was the thesis that population growth, industrialization, malnutrition, and the depletion of nonrenewable natural resources placed the future of humanity at risk.

Using mathematical models that correlated demographic variables, food production, and pollution, the Club of Rome reached a well-known conclusion:

> If the present growth trends in world population, industrialization, pollution, food production, and resource depletion continue unchanged, the limits to growth on this planet will be reached at some point within the next hundred years. The most probable result will be a rather sudden and uncontrollable decline in both population and industrial capacity (Meadows et al., 1972, p. 23).

Rising demand for resources and increasing pollution establish clear limits to economic growth – suggesting, therefore, that growth itself must cease. The political response to this proposition appeared in 1987 with *Our Common Future*, commonly known as the Brundtland Report, published by the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED). The report emphatically affirmed that growth could continue, provided that it was sustainable (WCED, 1987). The interval between the warning sounded by *The Limits to Growth* (Meadows et al., 1972) and the Brundtland response (WCED, 1987), together with the years that followed, was not an empty period. Rather, it was precisely the period during which the critique of growth was domesticated and transformed into an agenda of governance.

At this juncture, the concepts of sustainability and sustainable development became institutionalized. The 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, known as Rio 92 or Eco 92, established sustainable development as a diplomatic consensus. The Kyoto Protocol subsequently attempted, in 1997, to translate the climate crisis into negotiable targets and market mechanisms. At the turn of the century, the report *Who Cares Wins* (The Global Compact, 2004) helped drive the emergence of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) criteria. It was within the context of what came to be known as climate governance that the language of resilience developed, initially as part of discussions on adaptation and institutionalized in a report (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC], 2007). Within just a few decades, the argument shifted from the thesis that it was necessary to "stop growing" to the proposition of "growing sustainably."

Let us further examine resilience, which today constitutes an important point of reference in attempts to address the environmental and climate crises. The concept of resilience originated in engineering and is associated with the general notions of stress and deformation of materials (Yunes & Szymanski, 2001). One of its historical references dates to the eighteenth century and to Thomas Young – a scientist and physician who studied nature, the human body, and movement. In his time, Young was regarded as the last man who knew everything, a characterization typical of a context in which encyclopedic knowledge still prevailed and no entirely clear distinction existed between the sciences of nature and society or between philosophy and science, all of which remained situated within the field of natural philosophy, that is, physics (Yunes & Szymanski, 2001). Young (1845) defines resilience as an impulse that opposes and resists a given pressure and is therefore proportional to that pressure.

The concept of resilience has been appropriated in numerous ways across different scientific fields. Today, in a variety of contexts, it refers to a body's capacity to resist pressure, with a greater or lesser degree of deformation, and to return to its original form (Yunes & Szymanski, 2001). The concept becomes more difficult to apply, however, when transferred to human beings – particularly in psychology, where the notion of "deformation" appears especially problematic: "to use but a metaphor, one might say that the relation between stress/pressure and non-permanent deformation of the material would correspond to the relation and situation of risk/stress/adverse experiences with final responses of adaptation/adjustment in the individual […]" (Yunes & Szymanski, 2001, p. 16).

We argue that this concern also applies to environmental sciences. For Escalera Reyes and Ruiz Ballesteros (2011), for example, socio-ecological resilience refers to the capacity of an ecosystem – understood as encompassing both environment and society – to confront change under conditions of stress and absorb that change creatively without losing its identity. Obermaier and Rosa (2013) similarly define resilience as a system's capacity to absorb disturbances while reorganizing through processes of learning and adaptation. This presumed capacity, however, appears to overlook differences among socio-environmental ecosystems (Matin et al., 2018), failing to analyze conditions of risk, scarcity, and vulnerability or even issues such as race and social class. According to these authors, traditional concepts of resilience disregard the needs of those excluded by structural inequalities, the asymmetries embedded in power relations, and unequal access to environmental resources.

CC BY

The use of resilience in environmental debates is frequently associated with adaptation and mitigation. In the case of adaptation, this association can be observed in the analyses of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which defines resilience as "the capacity of interconnected social, economic and ecological systems to cope with a hazardous event, trend or disturbance, responding or reorganizing in ways that maintain their essential function, identity and structure" (IPCC, 2023, p. 12).

Thus, "resilience is a positive attribute when it maintains the capacity for adaptation, learning and/or transformation" (IPCC, 2023, p. 12). Adaptation, according to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), concerns adjustments in natural and human systems in response to current or anticipated climatic effects (IPCC, 2001). Mitigation, in turn, refers to actions intended to reduce the negative impacts of climate change, particularly by reducing greenhouse gas emissions through the transition to clean energy sources and increased energy efficiency.

The warnings articulated in *Silent Spring* (Carson, 1962) and *The Limits to Growth* (Meadows et al., 1972), along with concepts such as resilience when applied to the Anthropocene, are emblematic in this regard. Yet these epistemic notions and metaphors, however historically grounded, are insufficient in the face of the challenges posed by the objective reality of the environmental and climate crises. The voracity of the commodity-producing mode creates crises that evoke Fraser's (2022) image of the ouroboros. This perspective calls for a critical and structural examination of the limits of these concepts and of the ways in which they reinforce the generality and imprecision of the Anthropocene, even when historically grounded in the notions of risk, scarcity, and resilience.

We can advance the debate on the Anthropocene by drawing on Fraser's (2022) concept of "cannibal capitalism." This concept helps make explicit the limitations of the Anthropocene itself, as well as those of risk, scarcity, and resilience. As formulated by Fraser, cannibal capitalism represents an effort to broaden the conception of capitalism – or to overcome interpretations marked by an economistic bias – by articulating it with the notions of exploitation, expropriation, and cannibalism within the context of the ongoing environmental crisis. Fraser conceptualizes exploitation as a form of value appropriation regulated within the processes of production and surplus-value appropriation. In contrast, expropriation entails the confiscation of labor or goods without the establishment of any contractual relationship between the parties (Fraser, 2022).

DISCUSSION: THE ANTHROPOCENE, CRISIS, AND THE END OF NATURE

Fraser turns to the notion of cannibalism as a way of characterizing social relations and, above all, the contemporary relationship between society and nature. The concept concerns the appropriation by certain social stakeholders of the capacities and power of others, to the point of destruction. The image of the ouroboros, the serpent devouring its own tail, completes her approach: through exploitation and expropriation, commodity-producing society becomes cannibalistic, and "the main course is us and nature" (Fraser, 2022, p.13). Capitalism, in its broadest sense, is the serpent that devours everything and, in doing so, ultimately destroys the system itself.

In addition to Fraser (2022), Bruno Latour (2017, 2018) makes a decisive contribution to this debate by warning that relating the Anthropocene to the environmental and climate crisis requires theoretical caution and political attention. Drawing on these contributions, we return to our central thesis: risk, limit, and resilience add new elements to the debate, but their theoretical, epistemological, and political limitations create conditions that sustain the structural reproduction of the system that generates the crisis – cannibal capitalism.

Anthropocene, risk, and limit

The broader the historical period encompassed by the concept of the Anthropocene, the greater the contradiction inherent in the concept itself. References to human action within historically decontextualized processes of the production and reproduction of nature result in the naturalization of the causes of the ongoing environmental and climate crisis. In short, the broader the temporal scale of the processes encompassed by the concept, the further it moves from the concrete causes of the crisis. For this reason, it does not seem theoretically or politically reasonable to broaden the notion of crisis to such an extent or to attribute an intrinsically destructive character to human action upon nature. Such formulations invoke, directly or

indirectly, a conception of human nature – one of the hallmarks of classical thought – that is itself problematic. This conception underlies numerous contemporary attempts to rationalize the environmental crisis and ultimately shapes certain definitions of risk, limit, and resilience.

In general, this conception operates on the Hobbesian premise that the human being is *homo homini lupus* and, by extension, a wolf to nature itself. This formulation embodies a deeply entrenched dualistic understanding of society and nature – a distinction foundational to the modern sciences (Stengers, 2018). Hobbes (1985), Locke (1988), and Rousseau (2008), despite their different formulations, contributed to the consolidation of this conception, which has shaped and continues to shape understandings of both nature and society.

Are we intrinsically wolves to one another and, by extension, predators of nature? Are we heirs to an Enlightenment vision that renders the concepts of human nature, society, and crisis ahistorical? The debate between Noam Chomsky and Michel Foucault in the early 1970s – the same period in which *The Limits to Growth* was published – concerning what is innate and what derives from the environment provides a useful reference for this discussion (Chomsky & Foucault, 1971). Without pursuing this controversy further, it remains necessary to problematize the ontology and epistemology produced by such dualistic conceptions and, among other things, to denaturalize the relationship between society and nature (Stengers, 1996, 2000, 2018).

There is no doubt that the thesis that human beings have become a geological force and that nature is being humanized is striking. Faced with the temporal complexities involved in dating the Anthropocene, Latour ultimately yields to geological time. After all, geologists appear to be in no great hurry: "It took them nearly half a century, for example, to decide on the Quaternary Era!" (Latour, 2017, p. 114). Within this debate, he raises a fundamental question: where do science and politics begin and end? (Latour, 2017, 2018).

The use of the concept, even within geoscience, is highly controversial, and several arguments suggest that it may be safer to refer to the Anthropocene as a set of events rather than as a geochronological epoch in the strict sense. After all, almost everything can be observed and mapped in the geological record: changes in river sedimentation caused by damming, water acidity, erosion, and alterations in atmospheric composition. Yet, as Latour (2017) emphasizes, the depth and nature of human impacts on the environment vary substantially across the temporal scale encompassed by the concept. A concept constituted so broadly lacks the necessary scientific consistency.

Zalasiewicz et al. (2017) offer some reassurance in this debate by arguing that, despite the controversies, many scholars in the field regard the Anthropocene as "stratigraphically real." However, they propose dating its onset to the mid-twentieth century. There is sufficient scientific evidence that human action has substantially altered nature. As the authors argue, these changes are visible in the rocks; however, scale clearly matters. Attempts to establish such broad temporal boundaries are invariably contentious and tend to overlook aspects of the complex relationship between human beings and nature (Gibbard et al., 2022).

Following Latour (2017, 2018) and Fraser (2022), we may be able to overcome the naturalizing impasse and the duality between nature and society implied by the Anthropocene by drawing on the notion of the "hybrid." This perspective directs attention toward specific social formations and even toward the dissolution of the boundary between nature and society. Such an approach may bring us closer to the concrete dimension of the risks and limits imposed by cannibal capitalism's unrestricted appropriation of the elements of nature (Moore, 2016; Stengers, 1996, 2000, 2018; Tsing, 2021). In precisely this sense, as these authors argue, the environmental crisis must be understood as a historically situated phenomenon, with the twentieth century serving as a key milestone. This historical framing directs attention to complex forms of appropriation, several of which may be characterized as cannibalistic. We can advance this discussion by examining some of the attempts to confront these crises, focusing in particular on resilience, a central concept in the official discourse of institutions and environmental policymakers, including those who emphasize the generic nature of the environmental and climate crisis.

Latour's contribution deserves closer examination because of its centrality to this argument. In *Facing Gaia* (2017) and *Down to Earth* (2018), he argues that the climate crisis is not a technical problem to be managed but an event that reorganizes the political bond itself. There is no longer a neutral "nature" external to us to which scientists and managers can appeal in order to end conflict and produce consensus. In Latour's formulation, Gaia is not the harmonious Earth imagined by reassuring ecological narratives but a set of agents that react to human actions, depriving the commodity-producing system of the comfort of an external realm capable of absorbing everything.

This shift has a decisive implication for the thesis defended here. If there is no neutral nature, then risk, limit, and resilience cease to function as merely technical categories and reveal themselves as inherently political categories, permeated by interests and disputes over who inhabits which world. The notion of the "terrestrial," proposed in *Down to Earth*, refers precisely to the effort to reconstruct common ground for political action without resorting either to the false neutrality of nature or to the abstract universalism of the "human" invoked by the Anthropocene. In this respect, Latour's critique converges with Fraser's notion of cannibal capitalism: both reject the separation between an autonomous economic sphere and an inexhaustible natural background, showing that this very separation sustains the reproduction of the crisis (Latour, 2017, 2018).

Anthropocene and resilience: the nature of the crisis

As noted above, when applied specifically to the environmental crisis, resilience refers to the environment's capacity to maintain its integrity under adverse conditions. However, several criticisms must be raised regarding what has come to constitute a broader discursive field. First, its contingent character must be emphasized: resilience for whom? Second, its conservative character must be problematized, insofar as it focuses on confronting the crisis while maintaining and preserving the existing system. Third, attention must be drawn to the fact that the concept refers to a system's reactions to forces considered external to it and therefore fails to account for internal contradictions that generate asymmetries and conflict (Brown, 2014).

Another issue emphasized in the literature, including the work of Martins and Ferreira (2011), concerns the need to consider scale. It is difficult to conceive of concrete action to confront the crisis without discussing the dimensions of governance, since innovations promoted at the local level quickly dissipate when they are not linked to structural change. In this regard, Ulsrud et al. (2008) observe that certain adaptation strategies reduce social inequalities more effectively than others. Klein (2007), in turn, distinguishes between two frameworks: UNFCCC-driven actions centered on national governments and development-driven actions anchored in Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and local organizations and linked to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Because mitigation and adaptation should not be treated separately but rather as interdependent processes (Fernández et al., 2016), Community-Based Adaptation (CBA) initiatives have gained prominence by recognizing that the most vulnerable groups will also be the most severely affected (Chiwaka & Yates, 2004) and by representing an advance over top-down approaches to adaptation (Ensor et al., 2018). Even so, as Brown (2014) warns, CBA depends on state participation and on moving beyond individualized projects toward multilevel adaptation embedded in large-scale political investment.

In discussing the theoretical and political pitfalls of so-called adaptive management within the discourse of resilience, Beymer-Farris et al. (2012), for example, draw attention to the political dimension of processes involving the appropriation of natural resources. Authors such as Nadasdy (2007), among others, emphasize how the rhetoric of resilience can conceal powerful corporate interests. It is important to underscore those concepts such as adaptation and resilience once again result from applying theoretical frameworks originating in the natural sciences to the analysis of society. This frequently produces weak theoretical and practical results because such frameworks are applied to social processes assumed to be governed by equilibrium – whether organic or mechanical – and consensus (Brown, 2014). What is at stake, in fact, is an old functionalist and conservative sociology dressed in the language of modernity and mobilized to understand the present.

We are therefore dealing not merely with "theoretical limitations" but with "theoretical choices" and their practical consequences. Like the concept of sustainability, these choices hinder the identification of the structural causes of the crisis. In our assessment, the issue goes beyond a poor theoretical choice. Drawing on authors such as MacKinnon and Derickson (2013), Brown (2014, p. 110) argues that "the empty yet ubiquitous notion that communities ought to be 'resilient' may be seen as particularly troubling in the context of austerity and of a reinforced neoliberalism." Hegemonic conservative modes of governance operating across different territorial and political scales produce knowledge with the political purpose of normalizing and regulating the crisis. The naturalization of these processes and relations is therefore also an instrument of power and domination.

Political polarization and the strengthening of far-right movements in recent decades have revealed the insufficiency of institutional responses formulated on the basis of the concepts of risk, limit, and resilience. The Anthropocene, particularly when associated with these concepts, does little to deepen this debate. Without seeking to revive romanticized conceptions of so-called traditional societies, we wish to draw attention to the diversity of relationships among society, community, and nature across the different historical periods encompassed by the Anthropocene. We also emphasize the urgency, when placing human beings at the center of the environmental and climate crises, of confronting the challenge of thinking and

acting according to a cosmopolitical understanding of life (Ferdinand, 2022; Haraway, 2023; Krenak, 2019, 2022; Moore, 2016; Stengers, 1996, 2000, 2018; Tsing, 2021).

The problematization developed here extends beyond identifying conceptual limitations; it has direct implications for how organization studies conceptualize the relationship between management and nature. By treating organizations as relational and situated practices rather than as entities positioned against an external environment, Good and Thorpe (2020), Ergene et al. (2018), and Wright et al. (2018) already point to the inadequacy of approaches that import assumptions of equilibrium and adaptation from the natural sciences. Authors such as Banerjee and Arjaliès (2021), De Cock et al. (2021), and Nadegger and Wegerer (2024) take this critique further by exposing the limitations of organization theory in the face of Gaia.

The present essay introduces a further shift in this debate. It is not enough to recognize organizations as relational; it is also necessary to make explicit that concepts such as risk, limit, and resilience, when incorporated uncritically into organization theory, operate politically by naturalizing the structural causes of the crisis and reducing confrontation to the mere management of impacts. In this regard, the discussion of "becoming-with" proposed by Cabacine and Fantinel (2026) gains force when articulated with the critique of cannibal capitalism: thinking about organizational boundaries in the Anthropocene requires asking whose interests those boundaries serve.

This leads to the need to move beyond critique and mobilize theoretical openings with a propositional orientation. Donna Haraway's (2023) proposals of "staying with the trouble" and "making kin" reject both technological optimism and apocalyptic nihilism, suggesting forms of organization that treat multispecies interdependence as a guiding principle rather than as an externality. Anna Tsing (2021), in describing the possibility of collaboration amid the ruins of capitalism, offers a productive image for organization studies: collective arrangements that emerge precisely where the project of progress has failed.

Stengers's (2018) cosmopolitical proposition, in turn, provides the epistemological gesture that sustains both approaches: "placing the sciences within politics" and rejecting the presumption of a neutral nature to which one might appeal in order to bring debate to a close. For organizational thought, these contributions converge toward a common objective: replacing the universalizing management of risks with situated practices that attend to power asymmetries and remain open to a plurality of worlds. This is not a finished program but rather a horizon that the present reflection seeks to identify and that the research agenda outlined below seeks to specify.

THE NEED TO REINVENT THEORY, SOCIETY, AND NATURE: AN ATTEMPT AT A CONCLUSION

In sum, the argument developed throughout this essay supports the thesis announced in its title: by naturalizing the causes of the environmental and climate crises through the abstract figure of a generic human being, the concept of the Anthropocene and its correlates – risk, limit, and resilience – ultimately become functional to what Fraser calls cannibal capitalism. The movement from the Anthropocene to the current environmental crisis, and from that crisis to cannibal capitalism, does not represent a sequence of juxtaposed themes but a single argument. Because these concepts naturalize the causes of the crisis, they hinder the identification of responsibility and, in doing so, secure the reproduction of the very system that produces the crisis.

Demonstrating this argument required making three points clear: first, the historical imprecision of the concept of the Anthropocene, evident in the controversies surrounding its dating; second, the conservative character of the concepts of risk, limit, and resilience, stemming from their origins in the natural sciences and their functionalist transposition to the social realm; and third, the political dimension concealed by these operations. The implications of this thesis are outlined below.

The definition of the Anthropocene that reduces humanity to the image of a wolf to other human beings and to nature ignores the historical character of the social formation that produces the environmental and climate crises. History offers numerous examples of relationships between society and nature grounded in collaboration and preservation rather than exploitation and expropriation. As Latour emphasizes, it makes little sense to refer generically to the "anthropic origin" of the environmental and climate crises (Latour, 2017, 2018). When properly circumscribed, however, and related to determinate historical periods and social formations, the concept of the Anthropocene may constitute a relevant and politically necessary theoretical tool. It is therefore necessary to politicize – or make explicit the political dimension of – concepts such as risk, limit, and resilience, with which the Anthropocene is frequently associated.

CC BY

Moreover, although the environmental crisis is global and systemic, its harms materialize differently in the Global North and Global South, between rich and poor, between men and women, and between White and Black populations – to mention only a few of the structural asymmetries and inequalities involved. The structural causes of the ongoing crisis also direct our attention to social stakeholders and to the class interests that benefit from the prevailing model of development and economic system. The degree of radicalism embodied in the solutions proposed by public and private organizations to the environmental crisis is therefore directly related to the more or less hegemonic interests that sustain that crisis.

The current economic system, deeply marked by political polarization, imposes significant constraints on the implementation of the structural changes required to address the environmental crisis effectively. The alarming denialist discourse of the American Republican Party, which defends the freedom and right of every American citizen to exploit domestic oil and gas resources, illustrates the treacherous terrain on which we operate.

In practice, the commodity-producing system disregards scientific warnings – even those generated within the system itself, such as *Silent Spring*, *The Limits to Growth*, and IPCC reports – while prioritizing profits derived from environmentally predatory processes. Alternative technologies intended to mitigate risks sometimes merely transfer individual and corporate responsibilities to society as a whole and to the environment, perpetuating inequalities, reproducing the cannibalistic logic, and generating vicious cycles.

The logic of a system that privileges capital accumulation and intensifies the commodification of nature and labor, even while employing the language of sustainability and resilience, has produced a world marked by exploitation, expropriation, and inequality. Commodification deepens and perpetuates these inequalities. Voices that are commonly silenced – including those of social segments, sectors, classes, and communities that defend collective and diffuse interests – must be heard. Building societies capable of moving toward net-zero carbon emissions and respecting planetary boundaries requires a collective reassessment of economic, social, ethical, and political priorities.

We argue that problematizing the concepts of the Anthropocene, risk, limit, resilience, and cannibalism can contribute to reflection on the nature of the crisis we are experiencing – a crisis in which the end of nature emerges as a permanent and radical threat. Following Latour (2017, 2018), the environmental crisis must be discussed by problematizing supposedly universal conceptions of the human being, humanity, and nature. We must ask, for example, who constitutes the *Anthropos* of the Anthropocene – that is, which social stakeholders have a historical interest in combating the environmental crisis and climate change within the context of cannibal capitalism. Doing so requires fostering a new ethics governing the production and appropriation of wealth and the relationships between human beings and nature.

The principal contribution of the present reflection lies in deepening the debate on the limits of the relationship between society and nature in the current context of environmental and climate crisis. Significant gaps remain in the organization studies and public policy literature. Whether intentionally or inadvertently, some of this literature reinforces the conservative rhetoric that the same system producing the environmental crisis possesses the tools necessary to address the ongoing environmental and climate crisis. One of the principal limitations of the present reflection was the difficulty of engaging more extensively with the rich theoretical and practical field of alternatives to the system that produces the crises discussed here. This field represents a fundamental component of a future research agenda. From a theoretical and practical standpoint, greater care in theoretical-epistemological interpretation may contribute productively to the construction of alternatives for confronting these crises across different territorial and political scales.

This limitation leads to a research agenda that we consider productive and that we organize along four lines. The first consists of empirical studies examining how public and private organizations mobilize resilience as a discursive device, particularly the gap between the rhetoric of adaptation and the structural transformations actually implemented. The second proposes a critical dialogue with the literature on supply-chain resilience (Wieland, 2021; Wieland et al., 2023). In this literature, the concept tends to reproduce the same conservative bias criticized here by defining resilience as a return to equilibrium and the continuity of commodity flows rather than as a transformation of the relations that produce vulnerability – a hypothesis that, if confirmed, would reinforce the thesis of this essay within an applied domain of considerable relevance to organization studies. The third line proposes mapping cosmopolitical alternatives – following the paths opened by Stengers, Haraway, Tsing, and Krenak – and translating them into situated organizational practices. Finally, the fourth line proposes a critical reading of ESG terminology and the corporate decarbonization agenda through the lens of cannibal capitalism, asking to what extent such instruments genuinely confront the crisis or merely administer it.

CC BY

REFERENCES

Banerjee, S. B., & Arjaliès, D-L. (2021). Celebrating the end of enlightenment: organization Theory in the Age of the Anthropocene and Gaia (and why neither is the solution to our ecological crisis). *Organization Theory*, *2*(4), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1177/26317877211036714

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: towards a new modernity*. Sage Publications.

Beymer-Farris, B. A., Bassett, T. J. & Bryceson, I. (2012). Promises and pitfalls of adaptive management in resilience thinking: the lens of political ecology. In T. Plieninger & C. Bieling (Eds.), *Resilience in the cultural landscape: understanding and managing change in human-shaped environments* (pp. 283-299). Cambridge University Press.

Brown, K. (2014). Global environmental change I: a social turn for resilience? *Progress in Human Geography*, *38*(1), 107-117. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132513498837

Brum, E. (2014, 29 de setembro). Diálogos sobre o fim do mundo. *El País*. https://brasil.elpais.com/brasil/2014/09/29/opinion/1412000283_365191.html

Cabacine, F., & Fantinel, L. D. (2026). Administração no antropoceno: repensando fronteiras com o devir-com. Cadernos EBAPE.BR, *24*, e2024-0191. https://doi.org/10.1590/1679-395120240191

Carson, R. (1962). *Silent spring*. Crest Book. http://library.uniteddiversity.coop/More_Books_and_Reports/Silent_Spring-Rachel_Carson-1962.pdf

Chiwaka, E., & Yates, R. (2004). *Participatory vulnerability analysis: a step-by-step guide for field staff*. Action Aid International. https://alnap.org/help-library/resources/participatoryvulnerability-analysis-a-stepbystepguide-for-field-staff/

Chomsky, N., & Foucault, M. (1971). *Human nature: Justice versus power – Noam Chomsky debates with Michel Foucault*. Chomsky.info.https://chomsky.info/1971xxxx/

Crutzen, P. J., & Stoermer, E. F. (2000). The anthropocene. In L. Robin, S. Sörlin & P. Warde (Eds.), *The future of nature: Documents of Global Change* (pp. 483-490). https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5vm5bn.52

De Cock, C., Nyberg, D., & Wright, C. (2021). Disrupting climate change futures: conceptual tools for lost histories. *Organization*, *28*(3), 468-482. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508419883377

Douglas, M. (1992). *Risk and blame: essays in cultural theory*. Routledge.

Ensor, J. E., Park, S. E., Attwood, S. J., Kaminski, A. M., & Johnson, J. E. (2018). Can community-based adaptation increase resilience? *Climate and Development*, *10*(2), 134-151. https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2016.1223595

Ergene, S., Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (2018). Ecologies of sustainable concerns: organization theorizing for the anthropocene: theorizing for the anthropocene. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *25*(3), 222-245. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12189

Escalera Reyes, J., & Ruiz Ballesteros, E. (2011). Resiliencia socioecológica: aportaciones y retos desde la antropología. *Revista de Antropología Social*, *20*, 109-135. https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_RASO.2011.v20.36264

Ferdinand, M. (2022). *Uma ecologia decolonial: pensar a partir do mundo caribenho*. Ubu Editora.

Fernández, L. G., Ventura, A. C., Andrade, J. C. S., & Lumbreras, J. (2016). Synergies and trade-offs between climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies: lessons from social technologies in the semiarid region of Bahia, Brazil, Latin America. *Latin American Journal of Management for Sustainable Development*, *3*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1504/LAJMSD.2016.078619

Fraser, N. (2022). *Cannibal capitalism: how our system is devouring democracy, care, and the planetand what we can do about it*. Verso Books.

Gibbard, P., Walker, M., Bauer, A., Edgeworth, M., Edwards, L., Ellis, E., Finney, S., Gill, J. L., Maslin, M., Merritts, D., & Ruddiman, W. (2022). The anthropocene as an event, not an epoch. Journal of Quaternary Science, 37(3), 395-399. https://doi.org/10.1002/jqs.3416

Good, J., & Thorpe, A. (2020). The nature of organizing: a relational approach to understanding business sustainability. *Organization & Environment*, *33*(3), 359-383. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026619858858

Haraway, D. J. (2023). *Ficar com o problema: fazer parentes no chthluceno*. N-1 Edições.

Hobbes, T. (1985). Leviathan (C. B. Macpherson, Ed.). Penguin Books.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2001). *Climate Change 2001: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*. (Contribution of Working Group II to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). Cambridge University Press. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar3/wg2/

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2007). *Climate change 2007: Synthesis report* (Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar4/syr/

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2023). *Climate change 2023: synthesis report. Summary for policymakers.* (Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). https://doi.org/10.59327/IPCC/AR6-9789291691647.001

Klein, R. J. T. (2007, July 4). *Adaptation in a post-2012. Climate policy framework - Some thoughts* [Paper presentation]. Workshop on Community-Based Adaptation, Practical Action, London, United Kingdom.

Krenak, A. (2019). *Ideias para adiar o fim do mundo*. Companhia das Letras.

Krenak, A. (2022). *Futuro ancestral*. Companhia das Letras.

Latour, B. (2017). *Facing Gaia: eight lectures on the new climatic regime*. Polity Press.

Latour, B. (2018). *Down to Earth: politics in the new climatic regime*. Polity Press.

Locke, J. (1988). Two treatises of government (P. Laslett, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Luhmann, N. (1996). Familiarity, confidence, trust: problems and alternatives. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: making and breaking cooperative relations* (pp. 94-107). Basil Blackwell.

Lupton, D. (1999). *Risk*. Routledge.

MacKinnon, D., & Derickson, K. D. (2013). From resilience to resourcefulness: a critique of resilience policy and activism. *Progress in Human Geography*, *37*(2), 253-270. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132512454775

Martins, R. D'A., & Ferreira, L. C. (2011). Uma revisão crítica sobre cidades e mudança climática: vinho velho em garrafa nova ou um novo paradigma de ação para a governança local? *Revista de Administração Pública*, *45*(3), 611-641. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-76122011000300004

Matin, N., Forrester, J., & Ensor, J. (2018). What is equitable resilience? *World development*, *109*, 197-205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.04.020

Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., & Behrens, W. W., III. (1972). *The limits to growth: A report for the Club of Rome's project on the predicament of mankind*. Universe Books.

Moore, J. W. (Ed.) (2016). *Anthropocene or capitalocene? Nature, history, and the crisis of capitalism*. PM Press.

Nadasdy, P. (2007). Adaptive co-management and the gospel of resilience. In D. Armitage, F. Berkes & N. Doubleday (Eds.), *Adaptive co-management: collaboration, learning and multi-level governance* (pp. 208-227). UBC Press.

Nadegger, M., & Wegerer, P. K. (2024). Rhythms of repetition and disturbance: reimagining business-as-usual in the Anthropocene. *Organization*, *33*(3), 396-415. https://doi.org/10.1177/13505084241303098

Obermaier, M., & Rosa, L. P. (2013). Mudança climática e adaptação no Brasil: uma análise crítica. *Estudos Avançados*, *27*(78), 155-176. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0103-40142013000200011

Rousseau, J. J. (2008). The social contract (C. Betts, Trans.). Oxford University Press.

Stengers, I. (1996). *Cosmopolitiques - Tome 1: La guerre des sciences*. La Découverte,

Stengers, I. (2000). *The invention of modern science*. University of Minnesota Press.

Stengers, I. (2018). A proposição cosmopolítica. *Revista do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros*, (69), 442-464. https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2316-901X.v0i69p442-464

The Global Compact. (2004). *Who cares wins: connecting financial markets to a changing world*. United Nations. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/280911488968799581/pdf/113237-WP-WhoCaresWins-2004.pdf

Tsing, A. L. (2021). O antropoceno mais que humano. *Ilha Revista de Antropologia*, *23*(1), 176-191. https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-8034.2021.e75732

Ulsrud, K., Sygna, L., & O'Brien, K. L. (2008). *More than rain*: *identifying sustainable pathways for climate adaptation and poverty reduction* (Report prepared for the Development Fund, Norway). Climate Technology Centre & Network. https://www.ctc-n.org/resources/more-rain-identifying-sustainable-pathways-climate-adaptation-and-poverty-reduction

Wieland, A. (2021). Dancing the supply chain: toward transformative supply chain management. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, *57*(1), 58-73. https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12248

Wieland, A., Stevenson, M., Melnyk, S. A., Davoudi, S., & Schultz, L. (2023). Thinking differently about supply chain resilience: what we can learn from social-ecological systems thinking. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *43*(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-10-2022-0645

Williams, A., Perego, P., & Whiteman, G. (2025). Boundary conditions for organizations in the anthropocene: a review of the Planetary Boundaries Framework 10 years. *Journal of Management Studies*, *62*(4), 1811-1846. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.13150

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.

Wright, C., Nyberg, D., Rickards, L., & Freund, J. (2018). Organizing in the anthropocene. *Organization*, *25*(4), 455-471. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508418779649

Young, T. (1845). *A course of lectures on natural philosophy and the mechanical arts*. Taylor & Walton. https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.27527

Yunes, M. A. M., & Szymanski, H. (2001). Resiliência: noção, conceitos afins e considerações críticas. In J. Tavares (Org.), *Resiliência e educação* (2a ed., pp. 13-42). Cortez Editora.

Zalasiewicz, J., Waters, C. N., Summerhayes, C. P., Wolfe, A. P., Barnosky, A. D., Cearreta, A., Crutzen, P., Ellis, E., Fairchild, I. J., Gałuszka, A., Haff, P., Hajdas, I., Head, M. J., Ivar do Sul, J. A., Jeandel, C., Leinfelder, R., McNeill, J. R., Neal, C., Odada, E., … Williams, M. (2017). The working group on the anthropocene: summary of evidence and interim recommendations. *Anthropocene*, *19*, 55-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ancene.2017.09.001

CC BY

Maria Elisabete Pereira dos Santos
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8565-1125
Ph.D. in Social Sciences from the University of Campinas (UNICAMP); Associate Professor IV at the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA).
E-mail: betesantos@ufba.br

Kleverton Melo de Carvalho
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1969-7955
Ph.D. in International Law from the University of Buenos Aires and in Business Administration from the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA); Associate Professor at the Federal University of Sergipe (UFS). E-mail: kleverton1@academico.ufs.br

Andréa Cardoso Ventura
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4371-632X
Ph.D. in Business Administration from the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA); Adjunct Professor at the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA).
E-mail: andreaventura@ufba.br

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

Maria Elisabete Pereira dos Santos: Conceptualization (Equal); Data curation (Equal); Formal Analysis (Equal); Writing – original draft (Equal); Writing – review & editing (Equal).

Kleverton Melo de Carvalho: Conceptualization (Equal); Data curation (Equal); Formal Analysis (Equal); Writing – original draft (Equal); Writing – review & editing (Equal).

Andréa Cardoso Ventura: Conceptualization (Equal); Data curation (Equal); Formal Analysis (Equal); Writing – original draft (Equal); Writing – review & editing (Equal).

RESEARCH DATA AVAILABILITY

The authors declare that no primary data were used.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE USAGE

The authors declare no artificial intelligence tools were used.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Hélio Arthur Reis Irigaray, Fundação Getulio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9580-7859

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Fabricio Stocker, Fundação Getulio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6340-9127

GUEST EDITORS

Antonio Feliciano, Instituto Superior Politécnico de Humanidades e Tecnologias, Huambo, Angola.

Carla Marisa Rebelo de Magalhães, Instituto Português de Administração de Marketing, Porto, Portugal. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7956-0753

Claúdio Roberto Marques Gurgel, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Niterói, RJ, Brazil. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7254-8980

Fernando Guilherme Tenório, Fundação Getulio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4082-4410

Fernando López Parra, Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, Quito, Ecuador. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3948-5127

Javier Jasso, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Coyoacán, CDMX, Mexico. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5305-9936

REVIEWERS

Francisco Roberto Pinto, Universidade Estadual do Ceará, Fortaleza, CE, Brazil. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2559-1524

Sabrina Soares da Silva, Universidade Federal de Lavras, Lavras, MG, Brazil. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0096-4742

Filipe Cabacine, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitoria, ES, Brazil. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6152-6079

PEER REVIEW REPORT

The peer review report is available at https://periodicos.fgv.br/cadernosebape/article/view/97420/90602