

Preface

This book is based on my forty years in higher education, and particularly my thirty years in higher business education, where I worked on integrating business and the humanities. For a long time, I conceived of my work as interdisciplinary. After more research, I realized that, in fact, the two fields had once been linked and that the rupture between them was only a few generations old. Understanding this rupture became my central focus. I took a genealogical approach (Part I), which led to the view presented in this book: for centuries, humankind has pursued knowledge for governance, including self-governance, and institutions that preserve, create, and disseminate this knowledge, for individual *and* collective flourishing. However, also for centuries, this idea was interwoven with ideas about and institutions associated with class, exclusivity, and continuity.

This combination fell apart in the twentieth century. Institutions organized under a new logic that valued the new per se and that linked new knowledge to new wealth and status. Reliable paths developed for individuals and organizations to exploit this synergy for themselves. In particular, science institutionalized in the research university as “basic science” in the disciplines and “applied science” in the professional schools. Together, they created far more value than either could do alone. The academy, the professions, and industry thus developed and thrived as a whole. The United States became a leader in all three domains and in the overarching idea of opportunity—what Mary Parker Follett called “dynamic society” and the chance for individuals to grow it and grow themselves in it. Both she and Chester I. Barnard envisioned a new knowledge field that would understand and master this mutually creative process.

At the same time, then, the possibility of a science of and for society emerged. But this science was not easy to distinguish from the old knowledge for governance. Also, the logic of separation and specialization,

rather than integration, prevailed in science and industry because it generated knowledge, wealth, and status immediately. For these reasons, the idea of integrating science with the old knowledge for governance to form a science of and for society was not pursued.

My experience, research, and inquiry over many years have convinced me that today the subject of management and the graduate school of business come closest to realizing this idea. However, as explained in Part I, there is still no discipline of management; more accurately, the discipline of management, because of its subjective nature, grew in the individual realm; and the business school, following professional science, grew institutionally and separated its formal knowledge from the individual's experiential knowledge. For Follett and Barnard, this move denied the creative, and therefore subjective, work of science. Moreover, it could not begin to comprehend the most elementary processes of human value(s) creation at the heart of cooperative endeavor, not just in science but in all fields.

For the opportunity to reintroduce the idea of knowledge for governance and interpret it today, I am grateful beyond words. It has been and continues to be the chance of a lifetime.

Margo Beth Crouppen of Stanford University Press, in contracting to publish this book, showed that she believed me capable of articulating this idea. She saw its expression through the most awkward stages, which certainly tested my own confidence and perhaps hers as well. Armand Hatchuel was my most vital interlocutor. Our many discussions over three years helped me understand the relationship between the history of the business school and the institution's inability to integrate the ideas of Mary Parker Follett and Chester Barnard. When the first critiques of the manuscript came in, he helped me approach them constructively with no loss of morale or energy. With his claims that seemed too bold—that management lacked a foundation, that Follett was a creative genius—he kept pushing my vision further even as I stayed close to the facts, which always proved his argument in the end. If the management field ever advances substantively, Armand will have had much to do with that progress, whether the historical record shows it or not.

By inviting me to give seminars at his institution, the Center of Management Science, MINES ParisTech, and at the International Federation of Scholarly Associations of Management (IFSAM), Armand also provided valuable opportunities to discuss my arguments and findings with many interested scholars, particularly his close colleagues Pierre Guillet de Monthoux, Romain Laufer, Pascal Le Masson, Blanche Segrestin, and Benoît Weil. Others who provided such occasions were Nicolas Berland, Jean-François Chanlat, and Anne Pezet of the University of Paris

Dauphine; and Chris Steyaert of the University of St. Gallen. The Haniel Foundation supported my seminar at the University of St. Gallen.

Many individuals critiqued the research at every stage. Charlotte Fillol commented on the first formal presentation of what became Part I. André Delbecq, Paul Godfrey, Joe Mahoney, Joel Podolny, André Spicer, and Ken Starkey offered helpful comments on drafts, including the original proposal, the first draft, and two revisions. I have incorporated their suggestions to the best of my ability. Even more valuable than the comments was their encouragement, which gave me the wherewithal to complete the task despite adversities.

My formal education and temporary lectureships have always left me feeling peripheral to the management academy. Without James G. March's many invitations to keep joining and rejoining the circle, this book would not have been written because I would have left the field. Whether it was to present a paper, contribute to a book, or visit with a distinguished colleague, Jim welcomed me in, time and time again, and moved others to do likewise through his example and his recommendations. If integration is the heart of management, then Jim has built the field through his practice as well as his theory—or as Chester Barnard would say, nonlogically as well as logically—more than anyone I know. I am also grateful to Jim for introducing me to Arjay Miller, the dean of Stanford Graduate School of Business from 1969 to 1979, who led the school to the top rank it holds today. My conversation with Arjay shed important light on how the business school integrated responsibility, adulthood, and higher education.

Over the years, many other colleagues extended invitations that brought me into and kept me in the fold. In particular, I thank Magnus Aronsson, Dominique Besson, Barbara Czarniawska, Jane Dutton, Jeffrey Ford, Bill Gartner, Slimane Haddadj, Daniel Hjorth, Sharon Livesey, Ian Mitroff, Mette Monsted, Milorad Novicevic, Woody Powell, Pushkala and Anshu Prasad, Zur Shapira, Chris Steyaert, Lucy Suchman, Valérie-Inès de la Ville, Karl Weick, and Mayer Zald.

This book has benefited greatly from the contributions of practitioners. Max Périé, my co-author on Chapter 8, worked steadfastly and patiently with me for three years. He brought executive experience and more important, the desire to codify this experience in terms meaningful to researchers as well as to his peers. Max cares about good scholarship, and his example gave me faith in the emerging institution of the executive-scholar and the possibilities for its development. Max's colleague Corinne Chamarande candidly shared her experience of working with Max. She provided a perspective that usually stays buried in the organizational hierarchy. This perspective lends rare insight into the ex-

ecutive's relationship with the larger whole of which he is a part, albeit a formative one. I am especially grateful to Corinne and Max for their willingness to put their names on this research. This gesture indicates the genuine possibilities for accessing managerial knowledge, a necessarily personal knowledge as shown in Parts II and III.

I am deeply grateful to my students, particularly the group that provided the occasion to write Chapter 9, and most particularly to Olivier Hug, who gave permission to include his work in this book. I also thank the students in my course "Human Resource Management and the Management of Human Beings" in the Executive MBA program at the University of Paris Dauphine. Showing special appreciation for the teachings of Barnard, they named their graduating class in his honor. This proved his contemporary worth and validated this study unreservedly.

The book follows on crucial foundational work done by others—particularly Joan Tonn's biography of Follett, which provides a rigorously documented and complete picture of Follett the theorist, scientist, and institution-builder; and the late William Wolf's research on Barnard. Bill passed away in June of 2009, one month before Stanford University Press and I signed the contract for this book. More than any other scholar, Bill appreciated Barnard's contribution and dedicated his professional life to keeping it at center stage. He gave the field the only extensive interview that it has of Barnard, obtained only months before his death in 1961. Recognizing the difficulty of Barnard's original text, Bill issued numerous "translations" that rendered Barnard's prose more accessible without compromising its meaning. He oversaw the publication of many important rare texts that help give a complete picture of Barnard the scientist and Barnard the executive. In our last conversation, Bill emphasized that my book must capture "Barnard the man." I promised him I would do my best. If I have met that goal, it is due to Bill's generosity in sharing his scholarly knowledge and his personal experience of Barnard the man.

Research and administrative personnel at the libraries of the City of Boston (Rare Books and Manuscripts Department, especially Roberta Zonghi), Carnegie Mellon University, Harvard University, Stanford University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Pennsylvania (especially Nancy R. Miller), provided invaluable assistance. I am especially grateful to Alice Schreyer and her staff at the University of Chicago Library and to Mary Munill of the Stanford University Libraries. In the former case, I gathered that my large scope and limited timeframe tested the system's limits. Despite that, every demand was met punctually and perfectly. As for Mary, she proved repeatedly that if the document existed it could be located and obtained in a matter of days.

Judith Hibbard, coordinating with the many different parts of Stanford University Press, saw the book safely through all stages of production. Janet Mowery read every line and made suggestions that improved the book's substance as well as its readability. I am also grateful to the many others at the Press, whom I do not know, who supported the idea and making of this book.

I could neither have started nor completed this work without the unflagging support of a close circle, in particular my mother, Mary Swanberg; my sisters, Ann Swanberg and Mary Lambeth; my stepson, Neil O'Connor, and his wife, Shannon O'Connor; my son, Alex O'Connor; and my dear friend Rosanne Kramer. They listened to arguments, read drafts, and put up with a mind that was always on this book.

Finally, the deepest thanks of all must go to my husband, Richard, who made this book possible in every conceivable way. Our twenty-five years together have proven the true foundation—visible and invisible—of this work.