

Volume 23, No. 24, 2002

Edited by / Édité par
Gary Spraakman
York University

Business History
Histoire des affaires

Reviewers / Évaluateurs

Bruce Buchan
Wendy Cukier
James Gillies
Russell Johnson
Robert Sexty
Jaana Woiceshyn

Queen's University
Ryerson University
York University
Brock University
Memorial University of Newfoundland
University of Calgary

TABLE OF CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

BEST PAPER / MEILLEURE COMMUNICATION

Combinations1
Barbara Austin (Brock University)

HONOURABLE MENTION / MENTION HONOURABLE

Management Theory in Context: Exploring the Influence of the Cold War11
Albert J. Mills, Elizabeth Kelley (Saint Mary's University), Bill Cooke
(University of Manchester)

The Management Fad Lifecycle Phenomenon: Canadian Evidence21
Dana Chaulk (MBA Student), Robert W. Sexty (Memorial University of
Newfoundland)

**Advertising by Accountants in Canada with Reference to Advertising by
Accountants in the Province of Ontario – History, Comparison and
Analysis of the Issues31**
Michael Maingot (University of Ottawa)

The Role of Government in Ancient Rome and Legionary Capitalism42
Karl Moore (McGill University), David Lewis (Citrus College)

ASAC 2002
Winnipeg, Manitoba

Albert J. Mills
Elizabeth Kelley
Faculty of Commerce
Saint Mary's University
Bill Cooke
Institute for Development Policy & Management
University of Manchester

MANAGEMENT THEORY IN CONTEXT: EXPLORING THE INFLUENCE OF THE COLD WAR

From Taylorism to the present it has been contended that management theory provides valuable insights into the workings of business through value-free scientific methods. How far have those insights been influenced by the socio-political context in which they were developed and what are the implications for theory generation? This paper explores that relationship through a focus on the Cold War era.

Wren (1979) postulates that “management thought forms a more coherent picture when viewed in its changing cultural milieu of economic, social, and political forces. Management is both a process in and a product of its environment”. Clearly this relationship has implications for the insights generated by a particular theory or school of thought. Take for example the Iowa Childhood Studies. There are some curious aspects to these studies whose explanation may, in part, be explained by the socio-political context in which they developed.

To begin with, these studies had a profound influence on the development of theories of organizational leadership and the emergent Human Relations school of management despite the fact that they were based on experiments with groups of eleven-year-old boys and focussed on broad social concerns with aggression. These experiments were a far cry from the industrial studies of factory life that characterised the Hawthorne Studies and Taylor's work at Bethlehem Steel. Indeed, the most oft-cited of the Iowa Child Studies -- Lewin, Lippitt and White's (1939) study of “patterns of aggressive behavior” -- has nothing to say on the relationship between leadership style and productivity that was crucial to later studies.

The impact of the studies was in part due to the involvement of Kurt Lewin and the fact that the content, methods and conclusions resonated with the pre-war zeitgeist. The original idea for the studies came from Ronald Lippitt, a graduate student, who was interested in the effect of different leaders on children and character building (Marrow, 1969). According to one source, “Lewin's reaction to Lippitt's proposal was deeply personal”(Gabor, 2000: 167). Lewin had left Germany in the early 1930s shortly after the rise of Hitler and was profoundly interested in “problems of democratic leadership and of the conditions for effective individual and group growth” (Marrow, 1969: 85). Under Lewin's direction the leadership studies came to focus on the difference between “democratic” and “authoritarian” styles, seeking to find out the extent to which, in practice, “democracy” was a real alternative to “authoritarianism”. As Lewin was to express it:

Have you noticed the peculiar mixture of desperate hope, curiosity and scepticism with which the newly arrived refugee from Fascist Europe looks at the United States? He has had to live in an atmosphere where democracy was considered identical with decadence, softness, inability to act, chaos, and -- above all -- as a big bluff. He hates Fascism with all he has. He is more than eager to believe in this ‘haven for the oppressed’ . . . Still, he cannot but hesitate

at every step; he can't help but [wonder] . . . is democracy more than an empty proclamation, is it more than a phrase for politicians? (quoted in White and Lippitt, 1972: viii).

Ralph White, a post-doctoral fellow with an interest in political science, joined Lewin and Lippitt on the project. For White and Lippitt “these ideas seemed important to us as students . . . [given] the challenging of Western democracies by totalitarian democracies” in the lead up to World War Two (White & Lippitt, 1972). Part of the more general appeal of the studies lies in the conclusions which indicated that democratically-led groups worked better than authoritarian-led groups; the latter fostering frustration, cynicism, excessive obedience, destructiveness and even “wars”. These popularly understood aspects of the studies, however, have also proven problematic for further study.

Initially, experiments focussed on contrasting “democratic” and “authoritarian” techniques of leadership but a third variable, ‘laissez-faire’ or “group life without adult participation”(Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939) was added. Here it is interesting to note the similarity between the names of each leadership style and the prevailing pre-war categorisation of nations into authoritarian (i.e., Germany, Italy), democratic (i.e., the USA, Canada, Great Britain), and laissez-faire (i.e., Belgium, France) states. The connection may be coincidental yet the stated concerns of the experimenters reveal a number of similarities with the political concerns of the time. They were particularly interested to know “what underlies such differing patterns of group behaviour as rebellion against authority, persecution of a scapegoat, apathetic submissiveness to authoritarian domination, or attack upon an out-group?” (Ibid.).

The researchers’ own explanation of the nomenclature is instructive. According to White and Lippitt (1972: 10-11), the names “seemed natural and appropriate” despite the fact that they “had so many different meanings attached to them, and so many values”:

As we reviewed the basic components of our three leadership roles and the effects they appeared to create, it seemed to us that in the long run it would help communication to use the terms “autocracy,” “democracy” and “laissez-faire” and to define them as concrete as possible rather than to stick to such “scientifically correct” but colorless terms as “role one,” “role two,” and “role three”.

The problem is that, although the results suggested the “fruitfulness of examining the behaviour of leaders”, the terms were “not totally unambiguous” and were not, for organizational analysis, developed “in an applied context” (Bryman, 1986). Indeed the terms were problematic and overly influenced by the broader socio-political context. The concepts of “democratic” and “autocratic”, for instance, reflected Lewin’s own peculiar and narrow interpretation, appearing as polar opposites of representations of ‘good’ and ‘bad’. As Lewin expressed it, “There have been few experiences for me as impressive as seeing the expression on children’s faces during the first day under an autocratic leader. The group that had formerly been friendly, open, cooperative, and full of life, became within a short half-hour a rather apathetic-looking gathering without initiative” (quoted in Gabor, 2000: 167). This was very much a straw version of autocratic leadership, and White and Lippitt (1972: 11) were later to admit that such a leadership style could also be cast in such a way as to be seen not as a stand-in for fascism as originally drawn but as one of the patterns of leadership found “*within* our democratic society”. The problem was further exacerbated by the use of “authoritarian” and “autocratic” as equivalent terms. Similarly, the researchers ran into problems with the “democratic” leadership style when it was found that one of their “democratic” situations engendered results associated with autocracy. Instead of hypothesising that there are some situations in which democratic may not be ‘better’ than autocratic leadership, the researchers argued that by failing “to stimulate the development of group procedure” the experimenter, Ralph White, had, in fact, applied a different form of leadership -- one which Lewin then labelled “laissez faire” (White & Lippitt, 1972: 11). Later researchers, inspired by this research, nonetheless abandoned the problematic terms to focus on narrower ‘production’ and ‘people’ oriented leadership styles.

The pre-war work of Lewin, Lippitt and White influenced the development of the Human Relations school of management. But this approach emerged and was refined in the immediate post-war era through the work of Abraham Maslow, Douglas McGregor, and others. It is to those thinkers and that era that the paper is concerned with. Our interest here is due to the profound influence that the development of management theory in that era has had on subsequent generations of management scholars. Our interest is also due to the omnipotence of Cold War politics during the period and its potential impact on management thought. Our starting point is located in Schrecker's (1986) assessment of the impact of McCarthyism on academic life in the US in the 1940s and 1950s. Noting that McCarthyism had a "chilling effect", Schrecker (1986: 339) concludes that,

the full extent to which American scholars censored themselves is hard to gauge. There is no sure way to measure the books that were not written, the courses that were not taught, and the research that was not undertaken. Yet, to look at the academic world's self-censorship is to explore only one aspect of the intellectual fallout of McCarthyism. We must also, and more importantly, examine the scholarship that was done. The fifties were, of course, the heyday of consensus history, modernization theory, structural functionalism, and the new criticism. Mainstream scholars celebrated the status quo, and the end of ideology dominated intellectual discourse.

In the rest of the paper we take up Schrecker's (1986: 339) contention that "we need further study of the period's main intellectual artifacts as well as serious research into what the nation's college professors thought and taught during the McCarthy years". What follows is a tentative step in that direction, that builds on some of our earlier work (Cooke, 1999; Mills & Helms Hatfield, 1998).

The Cold War and Socio-Political Discourse

This section explores the institutional impacts of the cold war, particularly those institutions that had some involvement in the development of management theory at the time. The significance for the development of that theory is twofold. First it affected the material circumstances in which management theorist produced their work, that is, it comprised the work environment which will have influenced in some way the production of that theory. Second, the theorists and the theory that we are particularly interested in is about workplace behavior, in terms of appropriate approaches to leadership (e.g., McGregor), and the motivations of workers therein (e.g., Maslow). Together, both factors suggest the value of reconstructing an understanding of the impact of the cold war on the workplace.

Overview. Debate on the contours and timing of 'the cold war' is beyond the scope of this paper. At its most fundamental, it can be described as an historical period when there was a state of hostility between the US (and its allies) and the Soviet Union (and its allies) that was "expressed in economic, political, or subversive action but stopping short of 'hot war'" or direct military confrontation (Bullock & Stallybrass, 1979). It did involve surrogate military action, including the Korean and Vietnam wars. We are interest here in the period 1947-1960, which marked the onset of the Cold War era and the period characterised by "McCarthyism." The onset of a cold war against the Soviet Union can be dated to the Truman Doctrine of 1947 when the US President developed a new foreign policy designed to provide direct support (economic and military) to any country resisting Soviet dominance or influence. The phenomenon of McCarthyism refers to the investigation of individuals' loyalty and political affiliations by agencies of the government. This process predated the activities of Senator McCarthy but reached its zenith in the 1950s under McCarthy's influence on the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC). The Truman administration instituted 'loyalty oaths' for government employees in 1947 but HUAC gave widespread publicity to individual's who were subpoenaed to appear before it. We are

particularly interested in this period because, as we argue below, it had a direct and powerful influence on the academic and business communities.

Socio-Political Discourse. The Cold War can be seen as having two key dimensions: (i) foreign policy designed to confront and counteract the activities of the Soviet Union; and (ii) internal security measures designed to contain the activities of those thought to be hostile to US foreign policy and/or in any way sympathetic to Soviet activities. The enactment of these dimensions helped to create a new socio-political discourse of 'un-Americanism' by which people came to be judged. Americanism, of course, has deep roots within US society but in the period 1947-60 a narrowly constructed version became prominent, complete with penalties for those who did not fit the profile. Loyalty oaths and senate investigations were not so much interested in establishing who was a good American so much as rooting out those deemed "un-American". The various gauges of un-Americanism included sentiments less than hyper-patriotic; being named as having association with one of a number of organizations or activities deemed "un-American" by HUAC; refusal to sign a loyalty oath, to inform on friends and associates, or to admit to and/or renounce membership of any organization deemed by HUAC to be subversive; being unprepared to accept blind obedience to the government and its agencies (i.e., HUAC); having a questionable sexual orientation (i.e., non-heterosexual); having no discernible commitment to a recognised (Christian, Hannah, & Glahn) religion (Caute, 1979; Goldstein, 1978; Whitfield, 1996); and having a 'foreign-sounding' name or background. Activities (either current or previous) that were deemed 'suspect' included any kind of support for peace movements, anti-racism campaigns, civil liberties, trade unionism, or people defending their rights before HUAC and government loyalty boards. A renewed stress on 'the American way of life' and an increasing suspicion of anything 'foreign' contributed to a heightened sense of ethnocentrism through numerous contrasts between the 'good' aspects of Americanism with the 'bad' aspects of other national characteristics. A new cast was shed on individualism, which was encouraged, on the one hand, by positive associations with Americanism and, on the other hand, through fears of association with any collective activity that could be seen as subversive.

Cold War on the Campus

Schrecker (1986) sees the effect of the Cold War on Universities in three related strands of activity. First, there were the overt and public anti-leftist interventions by university administrators, with the support of some faculty members. Second, there were the less public punishment of politically incorrect academics, through failures to promote or grant tenure, and rescinding of job offers. Third, there were the formal inquisitions into the Higher Education sector. These were initiated through state legislatures, and most (in)famously in the joint investigations of HUAC and its Senate equivalent, the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee (SISS) but also through the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) which acted as an agent of surveillance and blacklisting, identifying the politically unacceptable, and intervening with administrations and faculty to obstruct their appointment and promotion (Diamond, 1992). Finally, it is also the case that some so called liberal academics in the forefront of the intellectual battle against communism, for example Sidney Hook, were also willing to do the dirty work of naming names, and making sure the careers of politically suspect colleagues did not prosper (Schrecker, 1986).

These strands were mutually reinforcing. For example, fear of the consequences of external scrutiny led some faculty members to accept what they thought was the lesser evil of internal policing, and not standing up against administrative victimization of colleagues; although, more than this, it should also be recognized that some right-wing academics actively supported this. HUAC's identification of certain organizations as communist fronts, and McCarthy's claim that refusing to testify on fifth amendment grounds (to avoid self incrimination) was to admit CP membership in turn provided some within the academy for grounds for dismissal. In turn these aspects of the scare were sustained by the FBI's illegal feed of information to sympathetic Senators and Members of Congress and to University administrators on individual staff members (Diamond 1992).

The Activities. The discourse of un-Americanism was developed out of several inter-related strands. Loyalty oaths, investigations, bans, the outlawing of previously legal activity, imprisonment, dismissals, blacklisting, and associated publicity.

Loyalty oaths were not new in 1947 when Truman introduced Executive Order 9835 that required all federal employees be free of suspicion of disloyalty. Loyalty oaths in some form or other had been in existence in the US since the pre-war era but what was different now was the prominence and the content of the new requirements (Schrecker, 1986). According to Cauter (1979: 269) the Truman loyalty programme “contained the most sinister and destructive departure in postwar domestic politics, one that was to ramify far beyond the federal service and poison wide areas of American working, educational and cultural life”. Essentially it introduced the notion of “sympathetic association” whereby people could be denied federal employment on the basis of their *association* with organizations (and their respective individual members) deemed “subversive”. Federal employees were required to sign an oath declaring that they were not nor had been a member of any of the groups listed by the Attorney General as “totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their constitutional rights” (quoted in Cauter, 1979: 269). The problem was that, in addition to the then legal Communist Party, the Attorney General’s list included almost 200 organizations that were *presumed* to be communist-front or subversive organizations (Schrecker, 1994). According to one estimate, more than 13.5 million employees came within the scope of the loyalty program -- including academics and staff of the state universities, and approximately 2,700 people were fired with a further 12,000 forced to resign (Cauter, 1979: 270-275). Employees were fired not only for current and even previous membership of a listed organization but also where there was “reasonable grounds” for suspicion of loyalty (Goldstein, 1978: 349). The latter case included those who, for whatever reason, refused to sign a loyalty oath. A number of academics that resisted the loyalty oath came in this category, including the eminent psychologist Edward Tolman.

In 1947 Tolman addressed the American Psychological Association on the occasion of Kurt Lewin’s death, referring to his friend and colleague as one of the two greatest psychologists of all time (Marrow, 1969: ix). Two years later, Tolman found himself addressing a more personal and pressing issue when the Regents of the University of California introduced a loyalty oath. Many of the faculty -- with Tolman as their unofficial leader -- felt that the oath was a threat to academic freedom (Schrecker, 1986: 118). This early resistance was to serve as a salutary lesson to academics in other institutions. To begin with, fifty percent of the faculty signed the oath almost immediately. Eventually resistance weakened with a compromise that accepted that active communists were “unfit” to teach in universities, and which left the policing of this oath to faculty committees: in short, faculty agreed to police their own. By now the number of non-signers had fallen to just 39 of approximately 1,300 faculty. The faculty committees investigating their colleagues ended up recommending the dismissal of six men and women due to their failure to co-operate rather than any evidence of any wrongdoing.

Years later Tolman was to claim that by ‘sticking to their guns’ the non-signers had a “chastening effect upon other university administrations” (quoted in Schrecker, 1986: 124) yet, despite one small-scale study of seventy professors by Marie Jahoda and Stuart W. Cook, the evidence would seem to the contrary. More likely that the lack of support for Tolman and his colleagues had a chastening effect on faculty at other institutions.

Concurrent with the loyalty oaths, the re-energised House Committee on Un-American Activities began a series of high profile investigations of subversion in American life when it took on Hollywood in 1948. Investigations at federal and state level soon moved to the universities, beginning at the University of Washington where three faculty members were fired. Again, there was some active resistance on the part of faculty and students but again it was a minority. Only 103 of the 700 faculty members signed an open letter critical of the dismissals (Schrecker, 1986: 101). Over the next few years close to a hundred faculty members lost their jobs throughout the university system and, due to extensive blacklisting, very few were able to get a job in another university. Many, although by no means all, faculty subscribed to the view

that it was an academic's duty to give public reassurances of his or her loyalty (Caute, 1979; Schrecker, 1986).

Among the other activities that directly affected academic life was a number of incidences where visiting speakers were banned from university campuses because of their supposed political beliefs, and the withdrawal of funding from academics whose research appeared 'controversial'.

Throughout this whole period the National Education Association (NEA) supported many of the repressive activities of the state. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), on the other hand, did develop policy critical of universities' actions in firing professors but it remained curiously inactive, doing little or nothing to galvanise faculty in defence of those who were dismissed.

The Outcomes. Very few universities escaped the turmoil of loyalty checks and investigations (see Mills & Helms Mills, 1999: 47). What evidence there is suggests that this took its toll on university life and academic endeavours. A 1951 study by Jahoda and Cook of a range of professional employees claimed that 'most of those interviewed regarded the loyalty-security program as part of a much larger interrelated complex of formal and informal pressures. . . The universal aim was to avoid the process of investigation. . . Caution was intense' (quoted in Caute, 1979: 275-6). Most of the interviewed had consciously changed their reading habits to avoid being seen with suspect periodicals. Certain topics had become taboo for discussion, including "admitting Red China to the UN, atomic energy, religion, equal rights for Negroes" (Caute, 1979: 276).

Four years later a study by Paul Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens found that many of the 2,451, "mostly liberal", professors that they interviewed reported to be scared. One in four of those interviewed reported that "political self-censorship, either in their professional activities or their private lives". And the survey revealed a yawning gap between professed liberal beliefs and a willingness to act on those beliefs (Schrecker, 1986: 309). For example, as one of the respondents noted, "a vigorous protest is not worth much when you can't get an audience, you just get fired" (quoted in Schrecker, 1986: 313). Many professors altered their syllabi and avoided controversial topics. The great majority "reflected the nebulous, pervasive concern with "sympathisers," "subversives," "un-Americans"" (Caute, 1979: 429). The Lazarsfeld study noted that the "widespread apprehension among . . . social science teachers [had placed a] notable damper on the activities and opinions of a sizeable minority". More than one third reported that 'their colleagues were less willing to express unpopular views in the community'. Indeed, some professors 'omitted certain topics from classroom discussions, and others slanted their presentations away from their real convictions'. Perhaps not surprisingly professors reported that their students were less willing to express such views in class as compared' to a few years earlier, earning them the appellation, "The Silent Generation" (Goldstein, 1978:380-1).

Summarising the impact of McCarthyism at the time historian Henry Steele Commager contends that the "new loyalty" was "above all, conformity":

It is the uncritical and unquestioning acceptance of America as it is -- the political institutions, the social relationships, the economic practices. It rejects inquiry into the race question or socialized medicine, or public housing, or into the wisdom of our foreign policy. It regards as particularly heinous any challenge to what is called "the system of private enterprise" identifying that system with Americanism. It regards America as a finished product, perfect and complete (quoted in Goldstein, 1978: 383-4).

A Selected Look at the "Intellectual Artifacts" of Business Education

It is perhaps not surprising that there is little or no evidence that business faculty took a public stand *against* McCarthyism. Indeed, the more prominent stands were vociferously in support of loyalty oaths and senate investigations of the academy. James Burnham, of 'the

managerial revolution' fame (Burnham, 1941), was active in a number of actions against suspected university radicals (Schrecker, 1986: 234). Clark Kerr, of 'convergence thesis' fame (Kerr, Dunlop, Harbison & Myers, 1973), was a colleague of Tolman at the Berkley campus, and not only signed the loyalty oath early on but, as the incoming President, oversaw its enforcement (Schrecker, 1986: 121).

Given that the term un-American was particularly applied to those who questioned capitalism business educators will, arguably, have had to tread particularly cautiously in their research endeavours. If not by inclination, such caution was reinforced by the fact that the large corporate foundations stopped funding 'controversial' research and the business community took a leading role in rooting out those deemed to be radical. The Chamber of Commerce, for example, established a "Committee on Socialism and Communism" to 'remove liberals, socialists, and communists from opinion-forming agencies' (Whitfield, 1996: 15). Large corporations fired countless people who were merely suspected of 'un-Americanism'. Businesses large and small controlled aspects of the media by threatening to pull advertising revenue. And, of course, the business community constituted a powerful sector of the university governing boards. On the union front, the Taft-Hartley Act ensured that radicals were purged from office and, on occasion, from union membership itself.

What impact, if any did any of this have on the development of management thought? For one thing, we know that in the development of the management textbook issues of racial and sex discrimination, inequalities of wealth, the role of unions, industrial conflict, and the problematic of private enterprise were largely absent until the 1980s (Mills & Helms Mills, 1998). Writing during the McCarthy era, William H. Whyte (1956: 108) commented that, "No one likes to bit the hand of his host . . . and thus businessmen are robbed of the kind of comment that could serve them well. It would be instructive for them to hear frank appraisal of the caliber of the textbooks that they subsidize for their training, or of their version of economic history. They don't." We also know that the few cases where the work was genuinely associated with broader social issues that this was generally "written out" of the accounts by popularisers of management theories and theorists (Cook, 1999). In the next section we make a brief exploration of the Human Relations school of thought and to extent to which it can be said to be reflective of the McCarthy era.

Human Relations Theory. With the exception, perhaps, of Lewin's left leaning concerns with democracy and change (Cook, 1999), the philosophy of Human Relations seemed suited to an era which valued conformity to institutional norms. The decision by government and big business to fund research and education in this area, to enhance the nation's intellectual and moral power, reflects the Cold War positivist epistemology (Nodoushani, 2000). As Whyte (1956: 44) expresses it, "the hero in human relations . . . is the organization man and, thus the quasi-religious overtones with which he gratefully endows it". This was not a shift, however, to the employee but to the professional manager. It signalled the birth of what has been called the "managerialist" approach (Mills & Simmons, 1999).

This school's distinguishing feature was a concern with group dynamics, "belongingness," and the centrality of the individual in any co-operative endeavour. Proponents were most concerned with understanding intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships as they relate to work situations and work groups (George, 1972). The resulting literature reflected the reality of American collectivism, with the individual of interest only as a group member. As in American society of that era, it was assumed that those who did not get along with the group had a problem and needed to be fixed. The Human Relations theorists, in the spirit of Cold War stability, did not consider the possibility of changing the situation or the reality (Whyte, 1956).

Similarly, absent from the bulk of this theory is any recognition of conflict or how to resolve it. In a society in which total consensus is purported to exist, conflict is not a topic of interest. When it was acknowledged by theorists, it was dismissed as simply a misunderstanding. Human Relations writers proposed that they could eliminate conflict and create equilibrium

between the needs of society, the organization and the individual simply by applying the methods of science (Whyte, 1956). As well, despite the emphasis on group membership, the Human Relations school was almost silent on the subject of collective bargaining and unions as a vehicle for belongingness (Lipsitz, 1981; Wren, 1979).

Despite the imputed humanistic bent of this school, it shared with the Classical School, a focus of the central issue of organizational control of workers and how to enhance it. One influential educator, Norman Maier, stated that group decisions were a “way of controlling through leadership rather than force” (Wren, 1979).

Even Lewin’s notion of democratic leadership was transformed during this era. With Lewin’s death in 1947 it was left to Lippitt and White to translate the promise of the pre-war research. Lippitt had gone on to become director of the University of Michigan’s “Research Center for Group Dynamics”, while White became Chief of the “Communist Analysis Division Office of Research and Analysis of the United States Information Agency”. Fuelled by anti-communist concerns they were to write of their fear of the appeal of communism to “uncommitted peoples . . . as a new and more genuine form of `democracy’” (White & Lippitt, 1972: ix). They went on to comment that, “as in World War II, the effort to make our kind of democracy as efficient as possible, and as attractive as possible to the uncommitted countries, seems to have a real bearing on the chances of our own survival (Ibid.). This statement is a near perfect reflection of the Truman doctrine, and goes on to link democracy with Americanism and free enterprise.

Maslow. The work of Abraham Maslow is but one of several exemplars of the Human Relations school. Maslow’s is interesting for a number of reasons. His work remains influential yet largely caricatured (Mills & Simmons, 1999); praised by Betty Friedan, yet criticised by subsequent feminist writers (cf. Cullen, 1992); a symbol of humanist psychology with strong views against those who disobey the status quo.

In the pre-war era Maslow had conducted some interesting work on dominance, sexuality, and diversity which had the potential to critique the character of hierarchical structures (see Mills & Simmons, 1999). Indeed, his research on the Blackfoot Indians in Alberta led him to conclude that competitiveness within American culture was harmful (Ibid.). Yet these ideas never developed into a critique of modern organization in the post-war era. This is, in a sense curious, as his post-war notion of ‘self-actualization’ serves as an implicit critique of human potential within the confines of hierarchical organization yet Maslow chose to work within that system. Indeed, in the process of modifying his hierarchy of needs theory for organizational application he suggested but did not develop a freedom of inquiry and expression need, and a need to know -- a need for curiosity, learning, philosophising, experimenting, and exploring (Hoffman, 1988). As has been expressed elsewhere, “it is not clear why those needs did not come to form part of Maslow’s final model but had they been included they could -- with their emphasis on control and domination -- have contributed to a more critical examination of the existing character of modern organization” (Mills & Simmons, 1999: 129).

At least part of the explanation may lie in Hoffman’s (1988: 227) contention that, “although Maslow very much wanted to see his psychological work put to larger, humanitarian ends, the mood of the early-to-mid-1950s conspired against it. McCarthyism frightened most scholars away from involving themselves in anything that might be viewed as even remotely socially critical or iconoclastic”. Nonetheless, contrary to his reputed humanitarian posture, Maslow’s vehement rejection of those who questioned or objected to government policy or societal realities pervades his writings. For example, in the introduction to Motivation and Personality, he exhorted readers to be aware of their blessings lest they be forgotten, not valued “until they are taken away from us”. He had no patience with malcontents and asserted that they should give up the alibi of social injustice. He rejected the idea of Utopia, observing that “if you demand a perfect leader or a perfect society, you thereby give up choosing between better and worse” (Maslow, 1954, p. xxi). This is a very clearly a call for readers to resist the temptation to

change or even criticize the American way, or they forfeit their right to the better American society, with the "worse" being Communism. To Maslow, any dissident was psychologically ill. He felt so strongly about this that he advocated imprisonment and punishment of all civil disobedients (Shaw & Colimore, 1988). Maslow's theories supported the continuation of the status quo, the American Way of Life. In explaining his "grumble theory", he used the example of a woman who wants a baby, has a baby, then wants a job, and rejects the mothering role. Maslow interpreted this in terms of the woman not appreciating her "blessings", rather than as movement up his own hierarchy of needs - a case of women always wanting more, "like the labour unionists" (Maslow, 1970).

Analysis of Maslow's theories clearly reveals a humanist concern with individual needs but they are cast in a framework of American individualism that was constitutive of the times. The format of the model itself, a hierarchy, is consistent with the focus of the Human Relations school – hierarchical organizations – and the elitist society of the time. The inference is that man works his way up the organizational ladder to attain ultimate satisfaction. Maslow displayed great faith in the potential of American corporations to become the locus of self-actualization of their employees (Lethbridge, 1986). The iterative nature of the hierarchy ensured that motivation and its result, effort on behalf of the organization, would continue. The purpose of the hierarchy, in organizational and societal terms, was control; if one can understand what drives behaviour, one can manipulate it. The hierarchy, however, was representative of a larger reality, a depiction of society of the Cold War, with the few ruling interests at the top and the masses at the bottom. Those in charge decided what was "best" for those below.

I think one consequence of the hierarchical theory of basic needs is a hierarchical or 'levels' way of thinking about much else: politics, economics, religion, etc. It also implies a theory of personality levels. The adult fixated at the safety or love level is a diminished man and must be treated accordingly...It's ridiculous giving a 'low' person the same laws as a 'high' person. Supreme court rulings treat every person as if he were Thomas Jefferson. I'd say the diminished person has fewer rights than the self-actualizing person (Maslow, 1979, p. 687).

Summary

In this brief exploration of the relationship between management and the Cold War we have begun the process, suggested by Schrecker (1986), of examining the "intellectual artifacts" of management writings. Clearly there is much further research to be done but we have hoped to suggest that the Cold War was so profound in its impact on academia that it is likely reflected in management theories of the time. The implications for today's thinking are open for debate but for us it does provide some explanation for Burrell & Morgan's (1979) characterisation of pre-1970 management theory as ahistorical, functionalist, consensus driven, and status quo oriented.

References

- Bryman, A. (1986). *Leadership and Organizations*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bullock, A., & Stallybrass, O. (Eds.). (1979). *The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought*. London: Fontana/Collins.
- Burnham, J. (1941). *The Managerial Revolution*. New York: Putnam.
- Caute, D. (1979). *The Great Fear. The Anti-Communist Purge Under Truman and Eisenhower*. New York: Touchstone.
- Christian, W. P., Hannah, G. T., & Glahn, T. J. (1984). *Programming effective human services : strategies for institutional change and client transition*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Cooke, B. (1999). Writing the Left out of Management Theory: The Historiography of the Management of Change. *Organization*, 6(1), 81-105.

- Cullen, D. (1992) 'Sex and Gender on the Path to Feminism and Self Actualization'. Paper presented at annual meeting of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada.
- Gabor, A. (2000). *The Capitalist Philosophers*. New York: Time Books.
- George, C. S. (1972). *The history of management thought*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Goldstein, R. J. (1978). *Political Repression in Modern America. 1870 to the present*. New York: Schenkman Publishing Co.Inc.
- Hoffman, E.(1988). *The Right to be human. A biography of Abraham Maslow*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kerr, C., Dunlop, J. T., Harbison, F, & Myers, C. A. (1973) *Industrialism and Industrial Man*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Lethbridge, D. (1986). A Marxist theory of self-actualization. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 26(2), 84-103.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created "Social Climates". *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-299.
- Lipsitz, G. (1981). *Class and culture in Cold War America*. New York: Praeger.
- Marrow, A. F. (1969). *The Practical Theorist. The Life and Work of Kurt Lewin*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality*.
- Mills, A. J., & Helms Hatfield, J. C. (1998). From Imperialism to Globalization: Internationalization and the Management Text. In S. R. Clegg & E. Ibarra & L. Bueno (Eds.), *Theories of the Management Process: Making Sense Through Difference* (pp. 37-67). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mills, A. J., & Simmons, T. (1999) *Reading Organization Theory*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Nodoushani, O. (2000). Epistemological foundations of management theory and research methodology. *Human Systems Management*, 19(1), p71- 81.
- Schrecker, E. (1994). *The Age of McCarthyism. A Brief History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford Books.
- Schrecker, E. W. (1986). *No Ivory Tower. McCarthyism & the Universities*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shaw, R., & Colimore, K. (1988). Humanistic psychology as ideology: an analysis of Maslow's contradictions/. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 28(3), 51-74.
- White, R. K., & Lippitt, R. (1972). *Autocracy and Democracy*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Whitfield, S. J. (1996). *The culture of the Cold War* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Whyte, W. H., Jr. (1956). *The Organization Man*. New York: Doubleday.
- Wren, D. A. (1979). *The Evolution of Management Thought*. New York: Ronald Press.