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Abstract

This paper attempts to locate Organization Theory (OT) properly under and within the overarching influence of history, society, culture and other knowledge fields within the ambit of which OT has taken its shape. It explores the ethical and philosophical basis of western civilization, the birth place of OT, under and within the influence of Renaissance, Reformation, Enlightenment and, Modernity. OT is then discussed in terms of the two opposing paradigms; Newtonian/Cartesian and Quantum/Relativistic paradigms of organizations and the effects of distinct, yet inseparably intertwined, notions of modernism and postmodernism are also traced in some detail. The paper draws an important conclusion that OT has inseparable historical and civilization links with social and natural sciences and philosophy and, an understanding of theorizing in organizations cannot be reached without first understanding the knowledge discourses, history and civilization within which the field of OT has developed and acquired its current form and stature.
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Introduction

This paper attempts at locating organization theory (OT) properly, under and within the overarching influence of history, society, culture and, other knowledge fields within the ambit of which OT has developed to its current form. The acknowledged ‘schools of thought’ in OT are based largely on the foundational disciplines of sociology, economics, and psychology, and given their preparadigmatic nature; it is evident that any discussion of school and/or theory development within OT has to be ‘subject to the larger development processes of these disciplines’ and, to the disciplines of natural sciences, philosophy and religion. Western civilization is the one within the ambit of which philosophy and sciences, natural as well as social, have developed and progressed, and as such it forms the basis within which OT has developed and progressed. That’s why this paper explores, in some detail, the development and maturation of the ideas on which this dominant western civilization is based, so that the contemporary theorizing practices in OT can better understood and placed in the larger context of history and civilization.

As I try to develop this historical and civilization approach to understanding OT, it is important to ask why organizational scholars have ignored or bypassed this link. Why their works exhibit a sense of being ‘ahistoric’ and why haven’t they taken up a more challenging task of linking theory with history and other elements of civilization? The literature demonstrates a paucity of studies linking OT with history and discourse and the sheer complexity of organizational life is said to be forcing organizational studies towards creating a ‘mediocre’ knowledge based on ‘middle range theory’, simplistic
metaphors and heuristic rather than grand theoretical analysis. This trend of divorcing history from organization theory building is perhaps also explainable in the light of postmodernism, which by its own very nature is against any metanarratives, and which rejects the modernist claim of ‘a historical march towards progress through science and technology’, largely because of the two world wars in the 20th century and Nazism, which, the postmodernists contend, also resulted from the scientific and technological progress and advancement of the modernist times.

This paper has two sections. The first section explores and examines, in some detail, the development of religious and philosophical ideas in the west. This section highlights why and how metaphysics and religion were deconstructed and chopped off from the mainstream body of western knowledge, not only because of the rational appeal of the scientific ideas (starting from Copernicus), but largely because the Church and the religion, along with the dreaded inquisitions, had made life so difficult for people that for them science actually ‘delivered’ them free from the heinous exploits of the church, and hence metaphysics, absolute ethics and religion were disposed off in a hurry with the hope that man was now the master of his own destiny – in short, the religious exploitation paved the way for scientific and ultimately the Industrial and technological revolutions. The second section then turns to the development of some core philosophical and scientific ideas of modernists’ era and concludes by comparing and contrasting the ‘two opposing paradigms’; Cartesian dualism and Relativistic quantum paradigms of organizations. The main focus of this section is, therefore, not the ascendancy of science and technology but the identification and illumination of a more subtle but common thread of relentless deconstruction of a Divine authority and religion and promotion of utilitarian and materialistic ethics and the emergence of scientific, social and political breakthroughs like evolution, psychoanalysis, freudism, taylorism, democracy and capitalism, which are discussed as part of that common thread underlying the myth of progress and development. Concluding remarks at the end of the section envision an axis connecting OT inseparably with other sciences (both natural and social) and philosophical insights.

Section One

This section analyzes the knowledge discourses of western civilization. The main reason for choosing Western civilization for this detailed analysis is that it’s the dominant civilization within which OT has developed and progressed to its current stature.

The Ethical and Philosophical Basis of Western Civilization

The difficult and tumultuous relation between religion and west can be traced back to the times of Augustine, who many believe to be the father and founder of western religious spirit. The early Christianity centered on the notion of ‘monasticism’, and preached the suppression of bodily desires to achieve salvation. Augustine was the first to experiment mixing the Greek rationalistic ideas with religion and most of his work attempts reconciliation between scripture and philosophy of Plato and Plotinus. But his flirting with Greek philosophy could not deter him from formulating his doctrine of ‘Original
Sin’, a central theme in western Christianity, painting a harsh and terrible picture of an implacable God:

“Augustine believed that God had condemned humanity to an eternal damnation, simply because of Adam’s one sin. The inherited guilt was passed on to all his descendents through the sexual act, which was polluted by what Augustine called ‘concupiscence’. Concupiscence was the irrational desire to take pleasure in mere creatures…..it was felt most acutely during the sexual act…..when God is utterly forgotten……Neither Jews nor Greek orthodox Christians regarded the fall of Adam in such a catastrophic light; nor, later, would Muslims adopt this dark theology of Original Sin”.11

From the very early days Christianity collided with the validity of scientific inquiry and by 6th century the Platonic Academy was closed in Athens with a fear that philosophical speculations had become an aid to heretics and was fuelling disputes among Christians.12 This resulted in closure of western mind towards earthly means of acquiring and creating knowledge and in many places libraries were burnt as books were considered to be full of errors and omissions.13

While this suppression of inquiry was going on, the period of Gregorian reform14 (1050-1130) initiated by Gregory’s claim that ‘Roman church had never erred, nor will it err in all eternity”15, paved the way for a much stronger clergy and the church being elevated to the status of a super state16, with the common laity having no or little control over the sacraments which they had to take from the church.17 By 13th century the crusade against heretics was formalized in the form of ‘inquisition’ by Gregory IX, and Innocent IV in 1252, allowed for torture to obtain confessions from accused heretics. The techniques used for torture included the ordeal of water,18 ordeal of fire, strappado and burning alive at the stake. During this period the pope was exalted as the most powerful and important leader in Europe and monarchies refrained from acting in defiance of the Church.19

Given the state like power of the church, the fear of torture and a miserable death through inquisitions, the tendency to suppress human inquiry along with literal interpretation of the scripture, it’s not hard to imagine how the first drop of scientific knowledge in the west in 1530 through the Polish astronomer Nicolaus Copernicus’ claim that sun was the center of universe20, later confirmed by Galileo in 1613, dealt a major blow to the supremacy of the church in west.21 So was the terror of Inquisitions that when the great mathematician philosopher Rene Descartes wanted to publish his work on physics, he withdrew the manuscript from the publisher, fearing a fate similar to Galileo.22 It is important to note that it was not Christianity or teachings of the Christ which needed to be disowned but the ruthless power of the church (amassed by the support of earlier emperors, growing rapidly in numbers, wealth, and range of influence)23 which it enjoyed over masses that had to be dissipated through scientific knowledge and discoveries. This perhaps also explains the ease with which west disposed of religion in the coming four centuries. The growing resentment against religion during and after the times of Copernicus and Galileo was peculiar to Roman Catholicism as other religions including the Islamic Sufis, Jew Kabbalists and Hindu mystics were taking people away from the literal interpretations of the scripture and their God was not as harsh and intolerant as the
one painted by the catholic church in the west and over the years, not surprisingly, religion and God started fading away as the ‘other’ of western society which now banked upon science and reason to find answers to their queries.

Roots of the Modernist Thought:
From Renaissance to Reformation to Enlightenment

History seems to testify that there was a ‘Renaissance’ of thought and culture between 1350 and 1600 which mainly resulted as a reaction to the cruelties of the Church in the name of religion, and with the rise of a more secular art, and later science and reason, Europe began to witness major structural changes and a widespread questioning of the authority of Roman Catholic Church and the Pope became the hallmarks of this period from 15th century onwards. The end of 16th century saw Europe on the verge of a transition as far as the conception of God is concerned and the reformers discovered new ways of considering God and salvation and the resulting split of Europe into two warring factions – Catholic and Protestant – changed the very face of western Christianity. It was during this period that Catholic and Protestant camps urged the masses to rid themselves of superficial devotion to rituals, saints and angels and to concentrate on God alone.

Earlier, the poetry of Petrarch of Florence (1304-1374) was instrumental in initiating an intellectual awakening of the Europe, starting from the South in Italy and then quickly spreading to Northern Europe. Education and learning, for the first time, became fashionable and scholars started receiving public respect and following. This intellectual awakening deeply affected the philosophical discourse and we see an increased speculation on the question of political power and its relationship to human nature, independent of the theological influences; the work of Machiavelli and then Hobbes provide the most striking examples of this new discourse. The following period of Enlightenment produced the most fertile period in the history of Western philosophy and from Descartes to Kant; this period witnessed an upsurge in the study of empirical philosophy.

Art adopted a totally new face in the Renaissance and the works of Michelangelo and his contemporaries transcended pure decorative art, and started reflecting the building spirit of ‘humanism’ – the study of man and his culture rather than the divine creations of God. In the 15th century the Italian humanists changed the medieval curriculum; the first step being the removal of morality poems. This emphasis on knowledge about man and the new ways of discovering God however could not stop the Church and Pope Innocent VIII and in 1484 he published, “...Bull Summa Desiderantes, which marked the beginning of the great witch craze that raged sporadically throughout Europe during the 16th and 17th centuries, afflicting Protestant and Catholic communities alike. It revealed the dark underside of Western spirit...thousands of men and women were cruelly tortured until they confessed to astonishing crimes (like having) sexual intercourse with demons, (flying) hundreds of miles through the air to take part in orgies where Satan was worshiped instead of God...The Christians of the West had always seemed to find that God was something of a strain and the Reformers, who had sought to allay these religious anxieties, seem ultimately to have made matters worse. The God of the West,
who was believed to predestine millions of human beings to everlasting damnation, had become even more frightening than the harsh deity envisaged by Tertullian or Augustine in his darker moments.” Inquisitions, tortures, witch craze and the extremely terrifying portrait of the God painted by Augustine led to a slow reaction and during this period the defiance of the churches through Voltaire’s ideal religion, sowed the seeds of the movement that would subsequently be known as Enlightenment.

In his book ‘Ideas: From Fire to Freud’, Peter Watson agrees that the initial sentiment leading to Renaissance arose in the form of an ‘intellectual surge’, but quickly clarifies that the, “Renaissance is now understood far more as an economic revolution than as a cultural one”. He then summarizes how the technological advances led to a ‘commercial revolution’; a starting point for capitalism and organization theory:

“A primitive striving after profit was replaced by expediency, calculation and rational, long term planning. Money of account developed around the same time as double-entry book-keeping and maritime insurance was born in the Tuscan cities where international commerce flourished. This caused freight tariffs to become more complex, which in turn increased paperwork……Writing became the basis of all activity”.

He then proceeds to ask the crucial question: “Does all this mark the birth of capitalism?” His answer is in affirmative because there a steady accumulation of capital, increased use of credit, separation of ownership and labor force, deliberate attempts to enlarge market, education of the youth in skilled trades, wealth replacing birth as the basis of class distinction, the marriage of aristocracy and bourgeois which created a new urban elite, Aristotle replacing the monk as an ideal and, above all the arrival of banking and replacement of the divine order by a rational order based on reason and experience. The period from 1500 to 1820, a period labeled as ‘mercantile capitalism’, saw the growth in capital formation in shipping and navigation, increasing world trade, establishment of secular learning centers in Europe, changes in the nature of family, marriage and inheritance and, the emergence of a system of nation-states so that the balance of advantage now belonged to Europe as compared to Ottoman, Moghul, or Chinese empires. The arrival of capitalism further weakened the grip of the church on masses who were now ‘suspended between faith and knowledge and….facts of individual experience here on earth became more interesting than the shadowy afterlife. Reliance on God and faith weakened’. The shift of focus from church to individualism and wealth, were jointly the first elements in what now be considered as ‘the modern way of life’. People like Dante, Petrarch, Machiavelli, and Montaigne wrote about intellectual freedom with skepticism towards the Christian message.

Philosophy and philosophers had witnessed an increasing influence from Christianity and theology of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274). These church philosophers conceived that natural law was to be the eternal moral law of the God; hence philosophy came under the shadow of the church. With the advent of science, however, philosophy changed its allegiance from theology, and this is still more or less where it is today, though now it seemed to be restricted to mainly linguistics as science and mathematics have apparently moved out of the reach of philosophers. Bacon and
Descartes were the main figures responsible for ridding philosophy of its theological burden.

Francis Bacon (1561-1626) and Rene Descartes (1596-1650) lived their entire lives between the publication of Copernicus’ *De Revolutionibus* and Newton’s *Principia Mathematica*; and by using the scientific discoveries of their time, moved philosophy forward and anticipated much of the world that Newton finally discovered. Bacon equated knowledge with power and also believed that knowledge could only be built up by the observation of nature, rather than through intuition or revelation. He exalted the ‘sense perception’ to the highest possible pedestal and thought it was possible to discover God through the study of nature and this ‘marriage’ between human mind and nature, became the basis for modern philosophical approach. Descartes, highly influenced by the skeptics of his time, was only certain about one thing; his own doubt, for in the very act of doubting he discovered his own existence, and this led him to his famous distinction between the subjective, interior and certain world of the self as opposed to the world of matter ‘out there’. Thus was conceived Descartes’ famous dualism, in which soul is understood as mind. According to him God created the universe but left it to progress on its own and that the basic building block of the universe was lifeless, atomistic matter. This was a major step in the history of western thought as it implied that ‘God had been established by human reason, rather than the other way around’. The authority of ‘revealed’ knowledge was seriously challenged and its incessant slippage was initiated which continues in the west till this day.

The first philosopher to make the most of the scientific revolution in politics (social sciences) was Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), from Wiltshire, England. A thoroughgoing materialist, with the belief that ‘knowledge of the world begins in sensation’, used a mechanistic explanation of voluntary motions to explain the innate human struggle for power and self-interest. He thought that sociological truth is just as discoverable in politics as it is in physics, biology or astronomy. This was an important thought contribution with far reaching consequences for sociology and organization theory, the worldview of natural sciences started finding footings in the world of humanities, later to be called as social sciences.

French Enlightenment and French Revolution, both are considered to be directly affected by a French genius called Voltaire. He adopted the Newtonian system, which gave priority to experience over intuition, and was convinced that, through work, religious ideas would eventually be replaced by scientific ones. By this time a new feeling began to spread throughout Europe, a feeling based on the view that earth ‘was designed for man’s terrestrial happiness’, and this view also led to the idea that if the rest of the universe was governed by relatively simple laws, then human nature itself should be governed by equally simple and accessible laws. The resulting investigation of human nature and the society became a defining aspect of the Enlightenment. In his book *Positive Philosophy*, Auguste Comte (1798-1857) further deconstructed religion and metaphysics by dividing history into three great stages, the theological, metaphysical and scientific and argued that scientific advances had broken the spell of religion and metaphysics, and like Hobbes, believed that the laws of natural sciences can also be
applied to humans and their societies. Comte’s English counterpart was Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), an ardent admirer of both Adam Smith and Charles Darwin, Spencer adapted their ideas to produce a picture of the society which was close to the one proposed by Darwin, but in this case instead of jungle, the playing field for evolution was society. Spencer believed that the evolution of societies, like that of species, results in the ‘survival of the fittest, weeding out less adaptable people, an approach that became known as social Darwinism. What Spencer was saying made a lot of sense to the Victorian middle class; that sociology supported ideas of laissez-faire economics and minimal governmental intervention in industry, health and welfare.

This spirit of Enlightenment, attempting to apply natural science’ worldview to human nature and human systems is aptly captured by Peter Watson in his book Ideas:

“The eighteenth century, the Enlightenment, was characterized by the first attempts to apply the methods and approach of natural sciences to man himself……It is a problem still very much with us. What we might call the ‘hard’ sciences – physics, chemistry and biology – have gone on making great progress. On the other hand, the ‘soft’ sciences – psychology, sociology and economics – have never acquired the same measure of agreement, or predictive power, and have never generated the same highly effective technology in the realm of human affairs, as, say nuclear physics, solid-state physics, organic chemistry and genetic engineering. Today, two centuries after the end of the Enlightenment, we still can’t say for sure what laws human nature obeys or even if these laws are the same as those that obtain in the ‘hard’ sciences”. 

Adam Smith (1723-1790) argued that people have selfish inclinations, have acquisitive intentions, which make it difficult to achieve social harmony, this harmony, he thought was not possible without ‘work’ and protection of private property, because only these two activities would ensure that personal interests don’t clash with overall social interests of the society at large. Max Weber (1864-1920), explains the notion of western capitalism in terms of the unique social values which emerged from the dominant religions of the 16th and 17th centuries, when capitalism was developing. Some of these values, like hard work and wealth, increase the chances of being one of the Gods’ chosen few; it’s here that capitalism finds a friend in religion.

The 19th century has been described as the Age of Progress, and in terms of Sociology, ‘modernity’ refers to the social-political and scientific-philosophical reality of western societies from roughly the mid 18th century onwards. The scientific discoveries of the earlier two centuries led to numerous technological advances in Europe and America, the resulting Industrial Revolution and mass production and distribution, started changing the demographics; in England, for example, in 1800 only 21% of the population lived in cities while by 1890 this figure had jumped to 62%. All of these ‘material advances’, have been accompanied by ‘continuing challenges to traditional religious beliefs and organizations’ and taken together, these two constitutes the basis of the secularization thesis of the west. As the 19th century came to a close, the Roman Catholic Church was desperate and at war with the modern world, to the extent, that in 1907, Pope Pius X, condemned modernism as the ‘synthesis of all heresies’. The philosophies of Hegel and
Mill epitomized the optimism about future, yet by the middle of the century, Kierkegaard questioned the optimistic assumptions of Hegel, and a period of ‘doubt’ over the scientific and rationalistic worldview prevailed in this brief period of ‘romanticism’. Towards the end of the century, Christian theology was more or less rejected but no philosopher could dare rejecting the moral ideas (of Christianity), the worship of meekness and gentleness and altruism.\textsuperscript{69} Nietzsche (1844-1900) definitely did not lack such courage and decried the lack of passion brought on by the comforts of the Industrial Revolution. He called against absolute standards and declared that ‘God is dead’. For him strength was the ultimate virtue, and weakness the only fault, good is what survives, which wins; bad is that which gives way and fails. This proposed shift in values had profound implications in shaping the future of ethics, morality, economics, science, philosophy and politics, not only in the west but also for the rest of the world.

Hegel (1779-1831), the German idealist,\textsuperscript{70} thought that totality of a thing cannot be explained without referring to its relation to other things and objects, as he himself says ‘The real is the rational and the rational is the real’, this paradox between rationality and reality, forms the basis of Hegel’s dialectics.\textsuperscript{71} Hegel’s dominant idea was that all economic, social and political life is in constant flux, this was in contrast to the classical economists like Ricardo’s view, that the main aim of economics was equilibrium.\textsuperscript{72} The development of the industrial society, an aftermath of the industrial revolution, had however shown widening gaps between the rich and the poor, and a different kind of poverty – urban poverty was now witnessed over and above the rural, agrarian poverty.

The times in which young Charles Darwin lived witnessed major changes in the political and societal set up of his country. While he was at Cambridge, the English Parliament had passed bills allowing Dissenters and Catholics to hold public office for the first time in centuries, a vast liberal tide was gathering to break down the ancient walls of privilege.\textsuperscript{73} This tide of change was accompanied by critical questions relating the Creator with the recently developed and developing science; “Could God’s goodness be deduced from the perfect adaptation of animals”?\textsuperscript{74} Natural theology was in crisis, and many expected a new life science to arise like a phoenix from its ashes. Here Darwin could make his mark. He could see the need to solve the great ‘mystery of mysteries’!\textsuperscript{75} Those were the times of division of labor, manufactories, Hobbes’ \textit{bellum omnium contra omnes} (war of all against all) and, Laissez Faire, all that fitted nicely with Darwin’s theory and its secularism.\textsuperscript{76}

By the mid of 19th century Darwin was voyaging around the world and his observation at the Galapagos Islands led him to his famous book \textit{Origin}, which was published in 1859. There were six crucial philosophical implications of this work\textsuperscript{77}: (1) the replacement of a static by an evolving world; (2) demonstration of the implausibility of creationism; (3) the refutation of cosmic teleology; (4) the refutation of absolute anthropocentrism; (5) ‘design’ in the world explained on purely materialistic processes; (6) the replacement of essentialism by population thinking. Given the times, all of these implications resonated very well, first with the scientific and the philosophical worlds, and later with the public.\textsuperscript{78}
It is strange that Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), who offered a sound refutation of Hume’s idea that moral principles are not determined by reason, was ignored by two of the most celebrated ethical philosophers of the 19th century; the Englishmen Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873). Bentham and Mill were utilitarian, a notion, which according to Mill, is traceable from Socrates who asserted it against the popular morality of sophists. The basic tenets of this view hold that man is basically a creature of feeling and sensibility and is pleasure seeking and pain avoiding animal and an act is good or right if it produces a surplus of pleasure over pain; an act would be wrong or bad if it produces more pain than pleasure. This view places more importance on the consequences, rather than the nature, of any act for determining whether it (that act) is moral or not. This principle underlies the pragmatic nature of this theory and also links it to Liberalism; freedom of individuals from all sorts of arbitrary authority, so utility is a substitute for Natural Law as the moral basis of the state, i.e. state action based on hedonist terms rather than moral terms. In nutshell it applies scientific and empirical principles to politics, and what Bentham and Mill did was to apply its principle as a theory of morals to the political sphere; Mill developed its ethical aspects, Malthus and Ricardo applied it to economic fields, Austin developed the legal theory of sovereignty, while Grote, Molesworth and Mill became its spokesmen in the British Parliament. This is how the underlying theme of hedonism/utility came to form the foundations of the modern western democratic, political, economic, ethical and legal systems and institutions and, this is how the ‘kingdom of God’ was replaced by ‘kingdom of man’ in the western thought. In Max Weber’s view the only inescapable fact is the ‘rule of man over man’ and, any construction of a world free from this fact, must be considered to be utopian.

The philosophical and scientific grounds cultivated by Hume, Hobbes, Comte, Spencer, Adam Smith, Bentham, Mill, Darwin and, Nietzsche, were tilled and exploited further by two modernist minds; Sigmund Freud and Bertrand Russell.

The credit for developing and popularizing analytical philosophy, which reduces philosophy to the much less speculative realm of objective logical inquiry, goes to Bertrand Russell (1872-1970). He inherited and carried forward the English positivist tradition, and thought that world’s woes were largely due to mysticism and metaphysics and therefore, abandoned Christianity, as much of it could not be phrased into mathematics. His search for ‘purity’ from metaphysics and mysticism was seen thriving in the ‘Vienna Circle’, formed by a group of philosophers and scientists during the 1920s and 30s, with the sole purpose of purging ‘meaningless’ metaphysics from philosophy, and to present science, as the new ‘other’, or God of the world.

Peter Watson, in his work; Ideas, clarifies many of the misconceptions about Sigmund Freud, whom he declares as ‘nowhere near as original a mind as he is generally given credit for’ and, present his critics’ views that he was ‘a ‘scientist’ only in quotation marks, who fudged and faked his data and deceived both himself and others’. After qualifying as a doctor, Freud obtained a scholarship to study under the famous physician, Charcot; there he met another brilliant Viennese doctor, Josef Breuer (1842-1925), who had treated a Vienna born girl, Bertha Pappenheim, and whom he described in his case-
book as ‘Anna O.’. Watson then describes the importance of this patient, Anna O.: ‘The significance of the Anna O. case, or at least the way Freud reported it, is threefold. It shows that Freud exaggerated the effects of the ‘talking cure’. It shows that he introduced a sexual element when none was there. And it shows that he was a cavalier with the clinical details. We shall see that these tendencies all repeated themselves in important ways throughout the rest of his career’. Another charge on Freud, according to Watson is, “that the entire edifice of psychoanalysis is based on clinical evidence and observations that are at best dubious or flawed, and at worst fraudulent……based on symbolic interpretation of the symptom. ….Patients never really volunteered these stories of sexual abuse. On the contrary they vehemently denied them. Invariably, it was Freud who ‘informed’, ‘persuaded’, intuited’, or ‘inferred’ these processes. In several places he actually admitted to ‘guessing’ what the underlying problem was……it was only in 1925, nearly thirty years after the events in question, that he first said publicly that most of his early female patients had accused their father of having seduced them….there is no question that he (Freud) radically changed the scenario of seduction – from real to fantasized, and…changed the identity of the seducers from strangers/tutors/brothers to fathers…..What sort of science is it where experimental or clinical evidence cannot be replicated by other scientists using the same techniques and methodology?……It is now clear that psychoanalysis does not work as treatment….The whole Freudian enterprise is ramshackle and cranky”.

Section Two
The Birth of OT & Two Opposing Organizational Paradigms

Organization theory has its roots in the prehistoric era, ancient civilizations and the medieval period. The Sumerians, Egyptians, Hammurabi, Hebrew and, Chinese are believed to make major managerial contributions such as record keeping, planning, organizing, controlling, therapy interviews, decentralization, documentation, establishment of minimum wage, centralization, scalar principle, exception principle, production control and, wage incentives. Aristotle was the first to note the importance of culture to management systems, Ibn Taymiyyah used the scientific method to outline the principles of administration within the Islamic framework and, Machiavelli provided the world with the analysis of the use of power, but many view the beginning of factory system during the Industrial Revolution in England in the 18th century as the birthplace of complex economic organizations and organization theory, but even through the middle ages in Europe, the monasteries were run like today’s formalized organizations and continued to develop the principles of organization (mainly borrowed from the military and political institutions) such as role specialization, carefully defined hierarchies, and rules and regulations. Therefore, the early development of organization theory revolves around efficiency; and the twin themes of coordination and cooperation, as its central thesis. The classical perspective of efficiency where organization are viewed as ‘well-oiled machines’, is associated with the development of hierarchy and bureaucracy and remains the basis of much of modern organization theory and practice. The word ‘organization’ is derived from the Greek word *organon*, which means a tool or instrument, and it should be no surprise that organizations are looked upon as entities which have ‘goal-directed’ behaviors and which pursue a ‘deliberate design’ for
accomplishing their activities. The increasing use of machines during the Industrial Revolution, required that organizations be adapted to the needs of machines and, one of the first organizational theorist to observe the parallels between mechanization of industry and bureaucratic forms of organization was Max Weber, who noted that bureaucracy in organizations routinizes administration exactly as the machine routinizes production.

Scientific management postulates that decisions about organizations and job design should be based on precise, scientific study of individual situations, and looks at management from the perspective of improving the productivity and efficiency of manual workers, whereas the general administrative theorists were concerned with the overall organization, till a group of theorists focused on developing and applying quantitative models to management practices and, finally, human behavior was emphasized in managing the organizations. These earlier theorists believed that organizations can be run under the umbrella of a few guiding principles, and if these principles were followed, managerial problems would disappear. These ‘few guiding principles’ mostly included means to achieve the ultimate end; efficiency and control, through precision, speed, clarity, regularity, division of labor, hierarchical supervision and, detailed rules and regulations. In general, the technical side of the ‘organization equation’ started to dominate the human/people side of it, a practice still common to this day. One witnesses this affinity for control in today’s industries where all the thinking and strategizing is done by a specific genre, called managers, leaving all the doing and implementing to be done by the employees down below. This same adherence to scientific management is also seen living vibrantly in some of the organizational efforts and endeavors to ‘dehumanize’, and control, and the consulting initiatives like business process reengineering, with its focus on improving the core business processes, is one recent example where the ‘technical’ is favored over the ‘people’. The technical and human split in the organizational equation can well be traced back to earlier days where Max Weber’s focus on ‘systems’ and Chester Bernard’s concern for the ‘individual’, posits the two (technical/people) at the extremes of the continuum of the organized activity. By modern times, bureaucracy, founded on legal-rational principles taken from military, religious and political institutions and, later from the factory floors, and complemented by principles of work organization enunciated by F. W. Taylor, the father of scientific management, was firmly in place in the management of large public and private organizations.

The industrial and technical revolutions, and the preceding scientific revolution, initiated by Copernicus (16th century) and Galileo, and reinforced by Newton, Descartes and Leibniz (17th century), represents a movement of thought in which western mind came to believe that eternal, timeless laws of nature could be understood not through revelation but through human reason and scientific method of inquiry and observation. In later developments, the same laws of nature were also thought to be operating in the spheres of social interactions, and hence the advent of social and management and organizational sciences is seen taking place from the 19th century onwards within the framework of the last 4 centuries, a framework or paradigm, using which the scientists have tended to understand the natural world in terms of machine-like-regularity, where given inputs are
translated through absolutely fixed linear laws into given outputs and according to this Cartesian/Newtonian worldview, humans will ultimately be able to dominate nature. Ralph Kilmann captures the essence of this Cartesian/Newtonian or old paradigm:

“The old paradigm, therefore, completely separates people from an outside, objective – existing on its own – material universe. All inert objects obey Newton’s mathematical laws of motion. Between objects, there is nothing but the invisible force of gravity, which pulls objects together; space itself is flat, cold, and empty”.

Leonard Shlain explains the surprising endurance of this paradigm:

“Euclidean space and Aristotelian time have formed the basis of a paradigm that has been remarkably enduring. This worldview has survived virtually unchanged since it was first proposed nearly twenty-five hundred years ago. Almost without exception everyone in western society uses this ancient system….It is nearly impossible to grow up without being inculcated with Euclid’s ideas at a very early age. Likewise, a tacit knowledge of Aristotle’s logic is a prerequisite for every professional, technological, and literate position in sophisticated society”.

Based on this old paradigm, the resulting Cartesian/Newtonian organizations tend to exhibit the following traits:

1. Exclusion of consciousness in the design of formal organizational systems
2. Organizations with passive jobholders following official procedures (formalization)
3. The white space between passive jobholders is implicitly ignored (vertical rather than horizontal hierarchies; control on the expense of cooperation)
4. The unconscious administration of a rigidly structured organization
5. The external control of passive jobholders (centralization)
6. The enforced segregation of passive jobholders (specialization)
7. The eventual self-destruction of a rigidly structured organization

The above seven categories describe the basis of the bureaucratic or mechanistic organizations, developed through the science and philosophy of the periods of Renaissance, Reformation, Enlightenment and, Modernism in the West.

**Organization Theory beyond Modernism into Postmodernism**

The modernist and the postmodernist thought is currently intertwined within the realm of organization theory literature which identifies the two contrasting yet interdependent styles of thinking as ‘modern’ and ‘postmodern’, ‘strong’ and ‘weak’, ‘downstream’ and ‘upstream’, ‘systematic’ and ‘edifying’, ‘representation’ and ‘anti-representational’, ‘academic right/academic left’, ‘representing’ and ‘intervening’, and ‘foundational/anti foundational’. The postmodern thought is articulatable only through the modern, yet the modern can only be defined and given expression as a fleeting moment of the postmodern, it is neither located nor locatable through the framing
of a simple succession of historical periodizations. Postmodernism is an intense critique of the traditional modern culture and politics; it is a break from rationality, a plunge into ambiguity, and a strange ‘self-glorification by means of the bizarre contention that its meaning is no meaning and its style the lack of any style.’

There isn’t much to discuss about the ‘philosophies’ of postmodern philosophers like Foucault, Lyotard and Derrida in terms of the richness associated with earlier philosophers; though some of their thoughts have found place in organization theory debates in the spheres of organizational heterogeneity, ‘total institutions’, organizational control of sexuality and the role of new technologies in organizational control systems. Apart from that, the only sport left with them are the language games; and the day doesn’t seem far away when even these ‘games’ would be entirely gobbled up by the English Literature departments. What an end to the traditions of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle! And this failed morality of western modernism, is echoed by Peter Watson when he concludes that “man’s study of himself is his biggest intellectual failure in history”.

The skepticism of Hume, the patriarchal values of Nietzsche, the psychoanalysis of Freud, Darwinism (both biological as well as social), the utilitarian and then the pragmatic political philosophies; all tend to produce “an incredulity towards metanarratives”, denial of authority and “institutionalized order” and exaltation of commercialism and its by-products to the status of icons, is what postmodernism is all about. It’s a crisis of late capitalism, a crisis of representation and a crisis of social movements; all occurring in reaction to modernism. Though it is understood as ‘a break from the past’, yet it strongly adheres to the ‘western secular’ ideas of the modernism, and if one deconstructs the definition provided by Jameson, that, ‘postmodernism is what you have when the modernization process is complete and nature is gone for good’, to, ‘postmodernism is what you have when the secular project of modernism is complete and God, religion and, metaphysics are gone for good’, that tenacious link with the past, identified above, becomes glaringly exposed. Postmodernism challenges global, all encompassing worldviews like Marxism, Christianity, Fascism, Stalinism, Capitalism, Islam, and modern science and dismisses them as logocentric, transcendental totalizing metanarratives and that the validity of all such thoughts is no more and no less than that of astrology, witchcraft, or primitive cults. At one hand postmodernism rejects metanarratives and overarching paradigms but on the other, it also abhors any preference for complex urban life style of the intellectual and attaches a renewed importance to all what the modernity has set aside; traditions, emotions, feelings, intuition, reflection, speculation, personal experience, custom, violence, metaphysics, cosmology, magic, myth, religious sentiment, and mystical experience, all find some solace and chance of recovery in postmodernism.

The impact of postmodern social and cultural forms on organizations, management styles and, organization theory is expected to create massive shifts in the modernist management paradigm of assuming that ‘the basic purpose of management is to increase the efficiency of organizational production’ and that, ‘organizational decisions must be organizationally just, even if they are morally indefensible’, but
postmodernism, in the realm of organization theory and culture, merely follows modernism and does not constitutes a progress or advancement over modernism. This is because of continuing ‘commodification’ of capitalism, which has only changed form in postmodernism; with the result that commodification has extended into new social spheres like health, welfare, and other public goods. Thus, in postmodernism ‘there is a tacit surrender to the market ideology……(where) market becomes essentially a metaphysical entity, a feature of human nature’.

It represents a ‘specifically North American world or global capitalist system distinct from the earlier forms of imperialism’, it is a form of society ‘where culture has greatly expanded and Nature has been replaced with technology as the other of society’. The real identifiable difference between modernism and postmodernism is the difference in the nature of ‘discourse’, the discourse of modernism rests on transcendent yet anthropocentric criteria such as ‘progress’ and ‘reason’. In contrast, postmodern discourse analyzes social life in terms of paradox and indeterminacy, and rejects the human agent as the center of rational control and understanding.

Postmodernism, according to Rosenau, questions many a themes of the modernist project; it ‘questions causality, determinism, egalitarianism, humanism, liberal democracy, necessity, objectivity, rationality, responsibility, and truth.’

That the postmodern organization theory is strongly embedded in the modernist era’s empirical and positivist thought, is evidenced by the new forms of organizational controls, for example, the corporate culture movement has become another tool to control how employees think and what they value in order to improve administrative control over productivity and quality, and the helplessness of the feminist scholars, who after deconstructing scores of academic and scholarly writings, conclude, that postmodern texts ‘are not advocating change but appear to be calls for a reinforcement of the status quo and the continued exclusion of women….from positions of power’. Postmodern writers are warded off by ‘the orthodox administrative science sub community’ such as ASQ, so that their points of view are obstructed from getting published. This is in spite of postmodernism’s deep adherence to empiricism and its affinity for a concrete form through ‘le quotidien’; daily life analysis or everyday life focus, an alternative to theory.

But some of the organization theory scholars are taking note of the modernist ‘amorality’ of organizations and their managers, and a revival of the Kantian ethics are sought, for example, by Freeman and Evan, who while proposing their stakeholder enabling theory assert that ‘all people should be treated as ends rather than as means’, and visualize that the ‘very purpose of the firm is…to serve as a vehicle for coordinating stakeholder interests’. In this theory, the corporate representative of the Board of Directors, is termed the metaphysical director, a managerial philosopher king, who is elected unanimously so that the universality requirement of Kant’s categorical imperatives, is maintained. Similarly, their theory of ‘fair contracting’, the ontological postmodern organizational forms, encompassing inter organizational arrangements, such as, Japanese Keiretsu, international strategic alliances, public-private alliances, total quality management (TQM) linkages among employees, suppliers, and customers, and ‘virtual organization’ relationships, and also the intra organizational networks such as cross-
functional product development teams and quality circles, all are examples of the way postmodernity is having its affect on the organization theory literature.

Other contributions to the postmodern organization theory literature is coming from the postmodern feminists, who by deconstructing language, have highlighted and exposed the ‘western masculine subject’, which is self-present, fully self-conscious, and in control. According to them the dominant concepts and knowledge used to construct reality in the West are all organized in terms of binary oppositions between two seemingly different identities, such as, ‘man/woman’, ‘activity/passivity’, ‘sun/moon’, ‘head/heart’, these binaries are both hierarchical and patriarchal. The first term of such pair is privileged and has the primary importance or priority over the ‘other’. Postmodernist feminism tends to highlight this fraud, and has set up the tradition of using ‘politically correct language’ in the management and organization theory literature. The key difference in terms of language, between the modern and the postmodern, is that of perspective; for the former language is a mere carrier of information and meaning, while for the later, it is a structure of material marks or sounds which are in themselves ‘undecidable’ and upon which meaning has to be imposed.

From an organization theory point of view, postmodern social science focuses on alternative discourses and meaning rather than on goals, choices, behavior, attitudes, and personality. Postmodern social scientists support an attitude that refocuses on what has been taken for granted in the modernity project; they support focusing on what has been neglected, rejected, suppressed, ignored, silenced, deferred and, excluded.

R. D. Stacy (2007) traces the development of organization theory in the postmodern era and following is a brief summary of those developments:

According to Stacy the Newtonian model of organization of nature and human systems assumes that cause and effect are related in straightforward linear way, and the behavior of nature/human systems can be predicted. Kant was the first to put forward the notion of systems, where focus shifts from the parts to the interaction between the parts. This is a move away from micro to macro, but not a move away from determinism and, stability continues to be the key issue. The nonlinearity is incorporated by adding positive feedback loops to the negative feedback loops of cybernetic systems. As a result of this nonlinearity, links between cause and effect become hard to identify, and so the outcomes are unpredictable. Control, therefore, becomes problematic, but control is still possible if ‘archetypal behavioral patterns’ are recognized. He then moves to an extension of the systems dynamics developed since 1950s, namely theories of mathematical chaos and dissipative structures, two branches of the complexity sciences that focus on macro level, and both are deterministic and nonlinear.

These insights, says Stacy, challenge the scientific project of control, which is based on predictability and certainty and which has prevailed in the west for hundreds of years. The theories of complexity sciences constitute a new dynamic which can be called ‘stable instability’ or ‘unstable stability’, the system can amplify irregularities in its interactions with the environment (‘fluctuations’), break symmetries and spontaneously produce a
shift from one pattern of behavior to another, a shift which, however, cannot be predicted. Another branch of complexity sciences, theory of complex adaptive systems, uses no equations at the macro level; the system is modeled as a population of agents interacting with each other according to their own local ‘if-then’ rules. The model demonstrates how local, self-organizing, interactions yield emergent order for the whole system, and also, evolution in the form of emergent novelty. These models focus on a system’s internal capacity to evolve spontaneously because of micro diversity. Here self-organization refers to local interactions between agents in the absence of a system-wide blue print or overall design.

The views of some of leading figures in the field of complexity, namely, Langton (1996), Gell-Mann (1994), Holland (1998), Kaufman (1995), Goodwin (1994) and Prigogine and, publications that use theories of chaos and complex adaptive systems into theorizing about organizations, namely, Thietart and Forgues (1995), Morgan (1997), Nonaka (1988), Takeuchi (1995), Sanders (1998), Brown and Eisenhardt, Wheatley (1999), Lewin and Regine (2000), Pascale (2000), Marion (1999), Allen (2006) are critically reviewed by Stacy. His main finding is that apart from Allen and Marion, all the other writers have retained the essentials of cybernetics and cognitivism (prescription and description) and the focus on the autonomous individual who stands outside the system and in effect controls it; the only ‘novelty’ is that these researchers are using the language of complexity science, but relying implicitly on the methodological assumptions of orthodox organization theory built around the Cartesian/Newtonian paradigm of modernism.

From Newton to Einstein

As discussed earlier, most of the present organizations are built around the science and philosophy of the Enlightenment and Modernity, and the Cartesian/Newtonian paradigm, based on the assumptions of Euclidean geometry, has already been discussed briefly in the earlier sections.

In the 20th century, Albert Einstein’s theories of special and general relativity and his thought experiments and mathematical calculations, started challenging the assumption of a flat and empty space, as he demonstrated that spacetime becomes curved and compressed by the presence of an object. Euclidean geometry was still valid for his ‘general’ theory of relativity, when spacetime remains flat; however, a non-Euclidean – curved – Riemannian geometry is needed for accurately describing spacetime when a mass is traveling at or near light speed. His revolutionary insights enabled him to substantiate a revolutionary ‘new’ scientific paradigm, having the ability to separate absolutes from the relatives, claiming (1) the absolute speed of light and relative nature of space and time; (2) the interchange between mass and energy through the absolute speed of light; (3) the curved and compressed geometry of spacetime; and (4) the equivalence of gravity on earth and acceleration in space for generalizing the theories of relativity. The space, instead of being empty, as assumed by Newton, is now thought to be composed of ’dark matter’ that cannot be seen or measured as yet, which is why space
itself still appears to be vacuous;\textsuperscript{170} this dark matter of spacetime perhaps consist of infinitesimal string like particles that can spin, rotate and, vibrate.

String theory or superstring theory creates a dynamic portrayal of spacetime: spinning, rotating, and vibrating multi dimensional strings; a portrayal, which is radically different from the traditional view of empty space containing passive, zero-dimensional points. Breaking apart and joining together of these elementary superstrings, might explain the creation and dynamics of matter/energy in the universe\textsuperscript{171} – here’s the window of opportunity provided by science for – ‘culmination of reductionist science’,\textsuperscript{172} and with it, the culmination of deterministic and reductionist social and organizational sciences! Yet, it would be extremely difficult for people to accept this ‘Quantum view’, and to consider that ‘if we humans did not exist to disseminate consciousness\textsuperscript{173} into the universe, the “actual” physical world “out there” would only be waves of potential for particles and object locations – not separate material substances that exist exclusively on their own\textsuperscript{174} – the world would not be there in material form were it not for a conscious mind to observe it.\textsuperscript{175}

That the higher, transcendent dimension of our consciousness creates our physical world makes most people feel uneasy and uncomfortable. But physics also now tells us, that this transcendent dimension enables matter to disappear and reappear in other locations, and that, once two pieces of matter have interacted in some manner, they will forever be connected within a transcendent dimension of consciousness, and within ‘just one universal consciousness that is shared among all human beings’,\textsuperscript{176} and that human mind allows holographic access to this universal consciousness.\textsuperscript{177}

**Quantum/Relativistic Paradigm**

Apart from its relevance to the field of nuclear physics and natural sciences, the main reason for using this new paradigm in organizational world is that: “when people and their organizations are the subject of study, the Cartesian/Newtonian paradigm simply cannot handle the uncertainty of movements to their next position or state of being – including each person’s next perception, thought, and behavior…and that understanding human behavior in organizations is thus radically different from predicting the motion of billiard balls.\textsuperscript{178} The transformation from a Newtonian to a Quantum organization, requires quantum infrastructure so that organizational members, who under the influence of old paradigm have become ‘inert molar objects’, can develop self-aware consciousness and thus become fully functioning ‘self-motion monads’.\textsuperscript{179} The Quantum Organizations would then be based on:

1. Inclusion of consciousness in self-designing systems
2. Organizations with conscious participants actively involved in self-designing processes (participation rather than formalization)
3. Cross boundary processes as explicitly addressed and infused with information (horizontal organization; based on a spirit of cooperation)
4. The conscious self-management of a flexibly designed organization
5. The internal commitment of active participants (decentralization, empowerment)
6. The empowered relations among active participants (team spirit, trust)
7. The eternal self-transformation of flexibly designed organizations

This new paradigm represents a revolutionary, new organization – one that is organically matched with a living, competitive, global economy. Many phrases can be used to describe this new type of organization: the empowered organization, organic-adaptive organization, network organization, horizontal organization, knowledge-creating organization, learning organization, and quantum organization, are a few names that can be given to this new type of organization.

Concluding Remarks

This brief note on the history of OT reveals the inseparable association between OT and other sciences; linked with Economics, Psychology and Sociology to start with, which in turn have developed in the image of natural sciences. The link of Physics, the first of natural sciences to develop established paradigms, with Philosophy is established through Sir Arthur Eddington and his notion of ‘scientific epistemology’, about which he observes that, “If our epistemology is at fault, it will lead to an impasse in the scientific developments proceeding from it; that warns us that our philosophical insight has not been deep enough, and we must cast about to find what has been overlooked”. An axis is therefore created connecting OT with social and natural sciences, philosophy and ethics; any attempt to understand theorizing in organization would be futile without understanding the knowledge discourses within which it is embedded.
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