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INTRODUCTION

In choosing a topic for dissertation research in sociology, or any other field, many factors come under consideration. There are, of course, practical and logistical problems of what is possible for a given student at a given time. The personal interests of the student may also weigh in the decision. But, perhaps the most significant factor influencing the choice of dissertation topic is the idea of contributing a truly original work to the discipline. That is, to accomplish empirical or theoretical research that previously had not received adequate analysis or attention. Every student would like to be able to satisfactorily defend his/her dissertation topic on these grounds, and I would like to begin to do so in this introduction.

In succinct terms my dissertation topic is to explore and discuss the theoretical underpinnings of democratic social organization, concentrating specifically on the democratic workplace. This topic was chosen only after I had initiated a preliminary review of the literature while considering an empirical investigation of the influence of workplace democracy on familial relationships. It was,
indeed, my review of this literature that prompted me to reconsider my original topic.

The theoretical and empirical research on workplace democracy is quite diverse. What is referred to here as workplace or organizational democracy is also referred to as worker control, worker ownership, worker participation, industrial democracy, economic democracy, self-determination, and participative management. The differences in terms often indicates a difference in the degree and form of the employee participation in the workplace. However, the terms share a basic, common premise, i.e., the possibility of nonmanagement employees exercising decision-making power within the workplace.\(^1\)

The broadness of this definition is an indication of the inability of many researchers to decide which conditions actually constitute democratic decision-making or democratic power within an organization. Much of the empirical research in the area of workplace democracy has attempted to measure the effect of participation on worker morale, productivity, and overall attitudes toward work. This research has produced inconsistent and nonconclusive results precisely because of the overall lack of a coherent, systematic definition of what constitutes a democratic social organization. Obviously, this situation demonstrates the need for an extensive theoretical analysis
of the assumptions that need to be advanced to proffer a
democratic complex organization.

One factor which contributes to this paucity of
theoretical work is the fact that since its earliest
inception in the United States, democratic forms of
workplace organization have most often been implemented as
a remedy for the problems caused by the various
nondemocratic forms of organization. Derber reveals that
as early as 1865 the problem of labor vs. management
replaced slavery as the major issue of national concern.\(^2\)
And, the idea of increased democratization of the workplace
was perceived by business and labor leaders alike as a
viable solution. Therefore, the theoretical development of
the democratic organization has, for the most part,
depended on the analysis of the problematic nature of other
forms of workplace organization. Since there is little
agreement as to what is specifically problematic with a
traditional organization there is likewise little agreement
as to what theoretical and practical changes would
constitute remedial action, i.e., democratization. To
significantly improve upon this situation an analysis of
the ontological\(^*\) nature of democratic and nondemocratic

\(^*\) The term ontology is used here as social ontology, that
is, to indicate the very basic, fundamental existence of
what is social (order, organization, institutions, groups,
forms of complex organizations needs to occur. Certain social scientists have recognized this necessity and point out that in order for workplace democracy to become a viable reality social organization itself is going to have to be conceptualized anew. Traditional concepts of authority, management, organizational goals, efficiency and, of course, power are going to have to be re-thought and not simply modified or expunged. Currently only a few projects have attempted to actually reconceptualize these concepts. The reason for this may relate to the nature of society, etc.) The ontology, or the theory of the nature of the social, consists of the most basic assumptions or definitions of the conditions which constitute its reality or existence. For example, ontology may be idealist or materialist, i.e., basing all social reality on thought or matter. Many other aspects of reality are expressed in a social ontology including the traditional philosophical problem of the relationship of the part to the whole. Social ontological realism, for example, expresses the existence of the social whole as something greater than and fundamentally different from the sum of the parts which comprise it. The term epistemology will be used later in this work to refer to the theory of the nature of knowledge, i.e., what constitutes a legitimate way of knowing. Epistemology may be rational, empirical, etc. Ontology and epistemology are basically theories of social reality and how it can be known, and, therefore, they are complexly interrelated. A theory of knowledge implies something of the nature of the object of knowledge and vice versa. Further elaboration of social ontology-epistemology and its distinctions can be found in: Stark, Werner. The Fundamental Forms of Social Thought. New York: Fordham University Press, 1963, pp. 1-13, and Hinkle, Roscoe C. Founding Theory of American Sociology 1881-1915. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980, pp. 60-64.
the various groups who are presently promoting the notion of workplace democracy.

Due to the severe economic crisis of the late 1970's and early 1980's, a variety of worker participation scenarios have been proposed by American management groups as a remedy for the current worker malaise and lack of available capital. The Harvard Business Review and other similar periodicals have published numerous articles on the various types of worker participation, with special emphasis on Japanese and Western European styles of management. Workplace democracy has even gained bipartisan support in Congress. American politicians and managers seem to have recognized: 1) a real problem exists in terms of employee performance and morale, and 2) a more participatory form of management has shown to have an ameliorating effect of these problems. This approach to improving worker productivity is not new, the "Human Relations" theorists suggested similar changes within the workplace to improve worker performance. Both the Human Relations approach and the current interest in participative management have a common goal, i.e., to increase productivity. This is clearly stated in various articles in management journals. A recent American Management Association publication addresses this issue directly:
Why should organizations support and managers use participative management approaches? The simple answer is that American organizations, like Japanese organizations, can profit from participative management in terms of worker performance and productivity. Although participative management is no panacea for all managerial ills, both research and practice clearly indicate that participative approaches do yield improved performance and productivity.

Although there is agreement on the effect of participative management, it has no consistent form in the U. S. and many programs are tailor-made to specific companies. The most common feature, however, of these models of participatory management tends to be the quality circle. Quite simply, the quality circle refers to groups of nonmanagerial employees coming together for discussions, most frequently on the quality and quantity of specific areas of production. The quality circle is able to make recommendations to management, and management often meets with the circle to convey relevant organizational information to them.

Along with the problem of poor worker productivity, the economic issues of recent times have brought about interest in another form of worker participation. Many companies are hard hit by the current lack of available capital, and a solution often proposed is considered a form of workplace democracy. The Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP), and similar ventures, allows workers to participate
in the workplace as owners of company stock. However, while most forms of participative management involve an increase in workers decision-making power, an ESOP does not necessarily imply any changes in the authority structure of the workplace. The rationale of an ESOP is that the purchase of stock alone is expected to improve worker productivity, morale, and relations with management, since "when workers become owners, their attitudes should reflect their new status." Worker participation is defined in terms of capital formation which, in turn, creates job security and increased commitment to the organization. Evaluating the "democratic" effect of ESOP-type programs is complicated. The difficulty in assessing the impact of stock ownership on workers behavior is due, in part, to the divisive manner in which such plans are often implemented. Many stock ownership programs are proposed by management as an alternative to pension plans, fringe benefits, and pay raises. Employees are expected to "save" companies by providing the needed capital. Critics of ESOPs demonstrate the financial burden they place on workers while producing very few benefits, monetary, democratic or otherwise.

Obviously those who promote participative management and stock ownership programs are more concerned with increasing productivity and finding new sources of capital than they are with creating a democratic workplace per se.
As noted above a substantial portion of this type of literature defines workplace democracy as a remedial approach to many problematic factors of the workplace. This management-oriented literature offers some critique of the traditional, authoritarian workplace, generally in terms of how particular features impede productivity. However, since these types of programs are being implemented at an ever-increasing rate, they do provide some practical evidence of the reconceptualization a traditional workplace will have to undergo to become democratically organized.

Another group of writers approach the issue of workplace democracy from an entirely different perspective. Their primary concern is not higher productivity, but to promote the idea that workers have a legitimate right to exercise control over their workplaces. The issue of democracy itself is being promoted here. The history of this perspective is long and quite diverse, and it may be unwise to delegate it to a single category even in this brief introduction. However, an important commonality can be found in this perspective's critique of the nondemocratic organization, i.e., the authoritarian organization prohibits workers from significantly influencing the design of their workplaces, because it is viewed as an objective, autonomous entity. Therefore,
these proponents of workplace democracy have introduced an important issue, i.e., the ontological nature of the traditional, authoritarian organization may exclude the possibility of democracy altogether. Workers cannot influence or control the workplace since as a social organization it exists as a social fact a' la Emile Durkheim. For Durkheim a social fact exerts a constraining, external, ahistorical influence on human action. This social facticity or social ontological realism is widespread in classical and contemporary organizational theory. The image of the workplace as a bureaucracy is perhaps the epitome of this view of the organization.

However, if it is the case that many proponents of workplace democracy have recognized the ontological nature of the traditional organization as the primary obstacle to democratization, why, then, is there still a need for a substantial theoretical project on democratic organization? First, many of those who are suggesting that such a project be undertaken are not attempting it themselves. Second, some proponents of workplace democracy view social ontological realism as perhaps the only status possible for large, complex, industrial organizations. This position is fostered by the limited success of democratization experiments, and by certain developments in management and
organizational theories. For example, sociologists and management theorists have attempted to subdue the rigidity of the rational, bureaucratic organization by developing alternative approaches to the workplace. The human relations school, systems theory, and more recently computerization, are all efforts to ameliorate the negative effects of bureaucracy. While some of these attempts have produced a degree of remediation, the ontological status of the organization is basically left intact, i.e., the organization is still viewed as autonomous from those who comprise it. This inability to overcome an ontologically realist version of the workplace has led many advocates of organizational democracy to consider all complex organizations suspect. Their response, then, has not been to develop a new theory of organization, but to suggest that only small, simple workplaces can be organized democratically. Rothschild-Whitt, for example, has developed a collectivist-democratic ideal type organization with characteristics such as: minimal stipulated rules, individuated decision-making, social controls based primarily on personalistic appeals, and employment based on friends, socio-political values and personality attributes. There is also a certain neo-marxist trend, which in the luddite tradition, considers industrialization itself to be the core of the authoritarian organization
problem. This tradition calls for the destruction of machine tools, and a return to craft and cottage industry.

Clearly, neither of these attempts to "democratize" the workplace could be implemented on a mass scale in an advanced, industrialized society. The Rothschild-Whitt ideal type would be of little relevance for organizations comprised of hundreds or even thousands of workers. The anti-industrialization trend demands a return to primarily an agricultural economy, since only a small percentage of the workforce had ever been able to work as crafts or tradespeople. Obviously, if democratization is going to be considered a viable alternative for more than a select group of workers more reconceptualization is needed.

Therefore, as noted above, the first step to developing a theory of democratic organization is to provide an analysis of the traditional view of the organization. This critique can begin only by discovering the root or origin of this image of the organization as an autonomous and independent power. Weber, to a certain extent, began such a venture when he suggested that the negative aspects of the "iron cage" were found not simply in its structures, but in a more fundamental component. He identified a type of Reason (formal rationality) as the legitimation necessary for the development of the bureaucratic organization. Weber described Reason as an
absolute value that justified social action and maintained social order.\textsuperscript{10} A type of Reason or legitimation has developed which facilitates or allows the organization to be viewed as an entity which is external, autonomous, and constraining to human beings. Therefore, the major thrust of this dissertation will be to examine the origins of Reason, as the legitimation for a specific form of social organization, and show how a social ontological realist view of organization developed from these origins.

This examination will begin with the "Father of Modern Philosophy," Rene Descartes. Descartes' development of the subject-object dualism and his attempt to "establish reason as the supreme judge of true and false" is the key to understanding the contemporary social ontological realist view of organization.\textsuperscript{11} Chapter One, then, will outline the basic aspects of Descartes' philosophy which are relevant to this discussion of social organization. Obviously, Descartes can hardly be considered a social theorist, but his influence on modern social thought cannot be denied. Furthermore, many ontological assumptions, which have hindered the development of democratic organization, can be easily traced to Cartesian philosophy.

Chapter Two will involve a presentation of those theorists/philosophers whose work is representative of the scholarly reaction to Cartesianism, and has had
considerable influence on contemporary sociological, organizational theory. These theorists include: Adam Smith, Auguste Comte, G. W. F. Hegel, Emile Durkheim, and Karl Marx.

Chapter Three will present Max Weber's analysis of social organization, specifically the development of bureaucracy. Weber raised many issues pertaining to the development of the authoritarian organization. In particular, Weber outlined a specific world-view which provides the legitimation necessary for individuals to act as if the organization is an autonomous power.

A presentation of classical and contemporary management theories (e.g., scientific management, MBO, MIS) which result in a reification of the authoritarian image of the workplace will constitute Chapter Four. Many of these theories were originally intended to subvert the inflexibility of former models. However, each theory will be demonstrated as another form of social ontological realism.

Chapter Five will summarize a variety of literature on workplace democracy which also fails to subvert social ontological realism. Chapter Six, the final chapter, will present various sociological theories which provide a basis for the reconceptualization of organization, so that a democratic form is ontologically possible. A variety of
practical issues concerning the workplace will be examined within the context of a democratic ontology. In the context of this discussion various problems which have developed in the process of democratization will be highlighted. Finally, suggestions for further analysis will be noted.

In sum, I have tried to present the need for a theoretical analysis of democratic organization. As workplace democracy, in its various forms, grows in ever increasing popularity, more and more questions will be raised as to what criteria must be fulfilled to produce a democratic organization. If sociologists are willing to initiate the reconceptualization necessary for such a venture they will be better able to understand the social impact of workplace democracy, and offer viable solutions to the many problems which accompany the formation of a new type of organization. A theoretical project of this sort will facilitate not only future empirical research, but perhaps the practical possibility of workplace democracy itself.
Footnotes


9 Al Szymanski, "Braver as a Neo-luddite?," The Insurgent Sociologist, 8 (1), 1978, 48.


CHAPTER I
The Philosophical Origins of the Authoritarian Organization

Introduction

The influence of Cartesian philosophy on modern social thought is so pervasive that many concepts, such as the mind-body dualism, are no longer thought to be one particular philosopher's rendition of the human condition, but truth itself having been discovered. However, before delving into Descartes' ideas themselves, it is necessary for the purposes of this essay to discuss the classic Western notions of social order and how these ideas influenced Cartesianism.

It may seem overly abstract or even absurd to begin a sociological discussion of the contemporary workplace with a treatise on Western philosophy. Without too much effort, however, it can be easily demonstrated that many philosophical ideas of human nature and social organization are evident in all areas of sociological analysis. The focus of this chapter will not be to trace all contemporary sociological concepts back to their philosophical roots,
but to concentrate only on those ideas directly related to the theoretical foundation of the autonomous, authoritarian organization.

Historically the concept of social organization was posed as a question of social order. Beginning with the pre-Socratic philosophers social order was considered a highly valuable, but unfortunately, sometimes precarious phenomenon. The task of these early philosophers was to develop or discover the knowledge necessary to create and maintain an orderly social existence. Traditionally, then, social order has been defined as regular, consistent patterns of human conduct, which includes behavior, values, beliefs, attitudes, and so on. Social organizations can exist only because certain forms of conduct are understood as acceptable or legitimate. Social organization has also been defined as goal-oriented behavior. In this context, social organization is a form of directing human conduct toward attaining certain goals or ends, while also defining which means are appropriate for these tasks. All forms of social organization, therefore, are viewed as dependent on a common knowledge or understanding of which specific actions, etc., are acceptable or considered legitimate.

From the early Greek philosophers to present-day social scientists, this issue of the origin and nature of the common understanding or common knowledge of legitimate
conduct has been given considerable attention. Throughout the history of Western social thought various processes have been identified which supposedly produce this common knowledge of legitimate action. Frequently social order was thought to originate from some form of a universal, regulating principle. The idea that legitimate human conduct is defined by an absolute standard of correct interpretation implies that social order exists as a reality in itself. This means that social order or organization is not dependent on some other entity, e.g., human beings, for its existence. The role of the social philosopher, historically, has been to discover the knowledge which provides a correct understanding of this regulating principle, and therefore, social order. Consequently, if social order is produced only by an ahistorical, universal phenomenon, knowledge of this phenomenon must likewise be untainted by historical, particular contingencies. This pure, unbiased, scientific knowledge can then serve as a normative standard for making correct judgements about the legitimacy of certain forms of human conduct. The philosopher's formidable task, therefore, is to discard the historical, particularistic, everyday aspect of human existence to uncover the fundamental, ahistorical truths. Once these truths are uncovered they become the standards for all forms of human
conduct. In this tradition, social organization becomes the manifestation of this regulating principle, which it may be wise to note, is often referred to in Western philosophy as Reason.

It is also important to note that this particular rendition of social organization is an example of ontological dualism, which developed in pre-Socratic philosophy. A dualist ontology suggests that reality exists in two fundamentally distinct realms. However, many times these realms of existence are not equally independent of each other. One reality is usually ontologically superior to the other, and to a great extent takes precedence over and controls the other. In terms of this discussion of social organization, the ordering principle (Reason) is ontologically superior to those who are ordered, i.e., human beings. This could also be discussed in terms of the object-subject dualism. Reason is objective (universal, absolute, ahistorical) while human existence is subjective (particular, contingent, historical). The same relationship exists between philosophical-scientific (objective) knowledge. This tradition also considers human nature to exist in an ontologically dualistic manner. Western philosophers have often contrasted the self-indulgent, emotional, self-interested side of human nature with the loftier
logical, rational aspect. In this analysis the rational, objective side of human nature predisposes the individual for social organization. The dual human nature provides an ontological link between the individual and the objective, regulating principle. Without a rational ability, scientific inquiry would be impossible, and knowledge of Reason would be beyond the grasp of human intelligence. The subjective side of human nature is often portrayed as what must be overcome by the individual, the negative side of human existence.

Many examples of this ontological dualism can be found throughout Western philosophy. Plato, for instance, made a primary distinction between Forms and Illusions. Forms, of course, are objective reality, and served as a rational plan for social order. Human nature, for Plato, existed as animal appetites and reason. Although Plato suggested a "middle ground" between these two extremes should be taken, he clearly recognizes reason as the superior quality. And, he also suggested that suppression of the appetites was the only manner in which to achieve a stable, social order. Aristotle, on the other hand, advanced a thoroughly organicist view of social organization. He posited social order as a natural phenomenon developing according to physical laws of nature. Aristotle also adopts a dualistic version of human nature with the
individual's animal instinct opposing his/her social instincts. Again, like Plato, Aristotle does not completely deny the legitimacy of animal instincts, but he does base social order on the objective, and therefore, gives ontological precedence to the social nature of humans.6

In the Medieval Period, the Scholastic philosophers advanced their own version of this dualistic ontology. What distinguishes the Scholastics, however, is their personification of Reason. The objective, regulating principle in Scholastic philosophy was, of course, God. However, God ordered the social in a specific form, he created it in his own image. Therefore, in the Medieval Period, social order was thought to reflect the mind of God, usually resulting in a rigid hierarchy of authority with direct representatives of God at the summit. This is a radical departure from Greek philosophy, in that, obtaining knowledge of the objective principle (God) was no longer a philosophical-scientific venture, but a theological task. Knowledge of legitimate conduct could only be attained through prayer and meditation, i.e., Divine Revelation. This position made Reason even more elusive since it could not be reached actively by human ventures. Revelation, as the means of gaining knowledge, was essentially a passive task. The Scholastics also
advanced a dualistic view of human nature, however, in this 
tradition, moral connotations of good and evil accompany 
the rational and self-interested aspects respectively.

The Beginning of Modern Philosophy

The final example of this tradition of dualistic 
ontological realism will be a detailed examination of the 
philosophy of Rene Decartes. Decartes, as the "father of 
Modern Philosophy," is considered to have radically 
altered the course of philosophical thought. This may seem 
like a contradiction to say that Descartes continues the 
Western tradition, and, that he drastically changes it. 
However, what is truly radical in Descartes' philosophy is 
his method of inquiry, not his ontological conclusions. To 
illustrate Descartes' attempt to provide a genuinely new 
philosophical method, and his displacement of the "axis of 
philosophy," a brief delineation of his work will be 
presented.7 This will be followed by a discussion of the 
implications of adapting the Cartesian method for the 
analysis of social organization.

Throughout his life Rene Descartes seemed troubled by 
the recurrent intellectual problem of how to unequivocally 
distinguish truth from error. As a college student he was 
continually distraught over the various intellectual 
arguments among the academic community. Statements of 
absolute certainty it seemed were impossible within any
discipline, not to mention the friction that existed between divergent academic areas. Therefore, what eventually led Descartes to become the "hero" of modern philosophy was his unabashed desire to discover the absolute truth. This desire resulted in the development of a method which would produce the "power of judging a right and distinguishing truth from error [and] is called good sense or reason." The Cartesian method is carefully outlined in his Discourse on Method and the lesser known Rules for the Direction of the Mind. In each work the goal of the method is clear: to carefully order one's thinking so as to acquire absolute knowledge.

In the Discourse and Rules, Descartes begins by lamenting the lack of certainty in the sciences and philosophy. Descartes identified mathematics as the only science that had achieved an acceptable level of certainty. He was convinced to reject all knowledge which could not achieve a similar degree of truthfulness. This is, of course, the first step of the method, to "accept nothing to be true for which any doubt remained." This step initiates Descartes radical departure from the past. All philosophical/scientific knowledge based on tradition, authority, faith, etc. is rejected as false, since it can be doubted.
Along with the past philosophy, Descartes also rejects all knowledge based on bodily (sense) perception. Sense and physical experiences in general were highly suspect to Descartes. There was little evidence to demonstrate the validity of empirical knowledge. Descartes pointed, for example, to the diversity of cultures which produced a wide-range of categories of color, textures, smells, etc., and concluded that the body was too unreliable in its perceptions to be considered the basis of truthful knowledge.

After rejecting all ontological claims of former philosophy, and all epistemological claims of the senses, Descartes was left with only his thinking, but doubting mind. It is, of course, at this point that Descartes realizes his goal of an undoubtable truth. Descartes' reasoning, this thought process had been able to logically doubt everything except the fact that he had been thinking, he had been doubting. Part Four of the Discourse is titled, "In Search of Philosophy (the Truth)," and here Descartes makes the statement, "I think, hence, I am was so certain and of such evidence that no ground of doubt was capable of shaking it." With this well-known phrase Descartes is able to shift the axis of philosophy to the thinking mind or the soul. Mental activity or thought becomes the prerequisite for all that exists. In the
Discourse the ontological reification of the mind-body dualism occurs as the mind and body are portrayed as distinct ontological substances. Descartes had arrived at the point where his is certain only of his thinking mind, and, therefore, "all things which are clearly and distinctly conceived are true." These clear, distinct ideas are intuitively known, and precede any deductive reasoning. According to Descartes, intuitively: 1) he thinks but also doubts; is unable to be certain of what is true and false, and therefore is imperfect, and 2) knowing that he is imperfect is able to imagine a state of perfection, a perfect mind, i.e., God. A more adequate version of the Cartesian dictum might read: I think, therefore, I am dependent on God's existence. Descartes had reasoned that a perfect, self-sufficient mind must be the source of all judgements of true and false, in fact, of all existence in general. This conclusion of the Cartesian method suggests that the path to truth is actually the path to God-Reason.

Many important philosophical assumptions are advanced by Descartes in the course of the method of doubt. These assumptions are traditionally viewed as the core of the "radical" nature of Cartesian philosophy, and can be identified in each part of the method. First, Descartes' original assumption that a system of absolute truth does
exist is often referred to as his creation of the supreme rule of evidence.\textsuperscript{16} This is, indeed, Descartes' notion of an absolute regulating principle about which no doubt could be entertained. The mathematical sciences were so attractive to Descartes because he felt they were the only systems of knowledge that were based on irrefutable proofs. Any science-philosophy that could not achieve a degree of evidence similar to mathematical evidence could be rejected as false.

Second, Descartes' appreciation of mathematics led him to copy mathematical logic in his method. All scientific-philosophical knowledge is to be modeled after mathematical deductive logic. All knowledge, with the Cartesian method, can be deduced from the \textit{a priori} First Cause, i.e., God or Reason.\textsuperscript{17} The \textit{a priori}, however, is intuitively not deductively known, and this assured the superiority and authority of Descartes concept of God. The idea of God "springs from the light of reason alone,"\textsuperscript{18} it naturally occurs in the human mind, and therefore, is not dependent on human reasoning for its existence.\textsuperscript{19}

Third, the mind-body dualism is, of course, implied in the deductive method. Descartes' deducing all existence from a perfect mind marked the beginning of a school of ontological rationalism-idealism that spread throughout Western Europe.\textsuperscript{20} Descartes is clear in the \textit{Discourse} that
mind and matter are categorically distinct, and independent of one another. However, in Part Six of Rules, Descartes explicitly states that the "chief secret of the method" is that certain facts are dependent on others, i.e., certain truths are only known from other truths. Descartes continues this argument by listing the various states which may be used to define a fact: absolute or relative; simple or complex; cause or effect; universal or particular; and independent or dependent. Furthermore, the relative fact is ontologically dependent on the absolute fact. This rendition of the relationship between facts clearly defines the mind-body dualism, and all ontological dualism in general.

These basic concepts—the supreme rule of evidence/deductive logic/mind-body dualism—are the keystones of the Cartesian method, and the reasons why his method is viewed as a radical departure from the past, even though it results in proof of the existence of God.

Social Implications of Cartesianism

The basic principles of Cartesianism, as a radical departure from Greek and Medieval philosophies have been presented in the above essay. It is now possible to discuss the implications of Cartesianism for an analysis of the social. In his writings Descartes was clear that his method should not be applied to political or social
phenomena. There are a variety of speculations as to why Descartes abstained from social-political commentary. Some believe Descartes, who had already caused a furor with the method of doubt, did not want to implicate himself any further by offering political criticism as well. Others conclude that the exclusion of the social and political from analysis was a logical conclusion of the Cartesian system. If the only legitimate sciences are those approaching the form of mathematics, then social and political sciences would be last to become legitimate since their subject-matter is the most complex and diverse.

In one sense, however, the reasons as to why Descartes offered no specific socio-political analysis are inconsequential, since a substantial portion of 18th and 19th century social philosophy was concentrated on applying the Cartesian method to those very areas. In fact, the Cartesian spirit in France gave birth not only to sociology, but to an entire school of philosophy which is still very much in evidence. The direct heirs of Descartes include such notables as Pascal, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Saint-Simon, and, of course, Auguste Comte. The works of these, and other French writers, indicate that Descartes' recommendation to exclude the social and political from analysis was distinctly unheeded. Not only did social and political matters undergo rational scrutiny,
but classic notions of the state, civil society and other forms of social organization were developed by these philosophers. The "philosophy of clear ideas" became the philosophy in France, and, consequently, had a major impact on Western European social thought in general. A detailed examination of the specific legacies of Cartesian philosophy will follow in the next chapter, while the remainder of this chapter will consist of a presentation of the implications of the Cartesianism for social analysis.

It should be clear from the preceding presentation of Cartesian philosophy that its "revolutionary" aspects must be well qualified to be taken seriously. To suggest a certain philosophy begins a new era of ideas might imply a complete change in the content of those ideas, and as demonstrated above, such is not the case with Cartesianism. Descartes begins a new philosophical era primarily by the development of the Method, and not ontological deviations from the past. In terms of a discussion of social organization, Descartes does not reinterpret the classical Western notion of a *sui generis* regulating principle, he only prescribes a more formalistic manner in which to gain access to this principle. This is unfortunate since Descartes' suggestion to radically doubt all past foundations of knowledge could have resulted in a truly critical analysis of all former philosophies which viewed
social organization as an authoritarian phenomenon. However, Descartes was not satisfied with a human ego cogito as the source of all legitimation. Many philosophers have tried to explain the logical necessity of the conclusion that a Perfect Mind must indeed be the source of all existence, but few have been able to deny that the existence of God-Reason is ultimately proved by the Cartesian method primarily because Descartes assumed the existence of an absolute principle from the beginning. In spite of claiming a complete skepticism of the past, Descartes' method is based on many traditional ontological assumptions, namely that an objective, ahistorical ground of knowledge exists and needs to be discovered. Descartes' effort was not to naively investigate the world, but to achieve a specific goal, i.e., to discover the supreme judge of truth and error, or Reason. The method is a means to a predetermined end, and the assumed objective nature of that end precludes the possibility of a human source of legitimation.

Therefore, through the retention of certain traditional ontological assumptions, and the development of an objective method of reasoning, Descartes was able to establish the position Reason more firmly than ever. The Scholastics did not reason or deduce that God existed; they simply believed it, i.e., they had faith in revealed truth.
The Enlightenment produced a resurgence of interest in a variety of areas, including Greek philosophy, mathematics and science. The Scholastics attempt to provide answers to all scientific-philosophical questions with articles of faith was increasingly difficult. Descartes rescued the somewhat faltering concept of God-Reason from the necessity of faith. The existence of God is proved by Descartes by no less than basic scientific method of modern philosophy, i.e., a systematic, deductive method based on a mathematical model. For Descartes, the method as well as its ideal goal is objective, i.e., removed from the diversity of human existence. The Cartesian method becomes the only legitimate manner in which to attain the truth. In this sense, social organization can only be understood as the manifestation of an objective, regulating principle, and the method employed to investigate social organization must assume the existence of such a principle to be valid.

Aside from these general implications of the Cartesian method, some specific mention should be made of the implications of the Cartesian dualism for an analysis of social organization. The subject-object dualism, of course, is the foundation of the entire Cartesian system, but specifically it lays the foundation for the development of social ontological realism. The subject-object distinction allows Descartes to define all historical,
particular phenomena as unjustifiable false claims. Reason alone becomes the basis of all truth, and as one Cartesian philosopher states "rational beings most naturally determine what is right and good, not from facts as they are, or have been but from what Reason says they ought to be." The impact of such a sentiment had serious consequences for nearly 300 years of French philosophy. Descartes was able to initiate a trend of philosophical inquiry which lacked any historical dimension. This trend, of course, could be categorized as ontological realism, which would later be developed into social ontological realism. Descartes realism assumes the part (ego cogito) is totally dependent on the whole (God-Reason) for existence. For later Cartesian social philosophers the parts (human individuals) are dependent on the whole (social institutions, organizations) as the source of correct interpretation of legitimate social order. Whatever the specific content the basic ontological realism assumes a whole or totality exists prior to and distinct from the parts whose existence it organizes, regulates, and determines.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has been an attempt to present a brief history of the traditional philosophical analysis of social organization. The philosophical trend
to view social organization as the manifestation of a
universal, objective, regulating principle has a long
history, and is especially evident in the philosophy of
Rene Descartes. Such a rendition of social organization
results in a situation in which individuals must look to
the organization as a measure or judge of what constitutes
legitimate action. The organization supplies the common
understanding necessary to ensure orderly, regular patterns
of conduct. Organizational knowledge or action which is
not based on Reason can be dismissed as irrational,
emotional or personal, and therefore, cannot serve as a
basis of legitimation. Any attempt to change or transform
the organization's structure can likewise be dismissed as
untenable since the organization is the embodiment of an
objective, universal source, and legitimate change must
originate only from this source. The structure of the
organization may seem to benefit certain individuals or
groups more than others, but such inequity cannot serve as
the basis for action since the objective nature of the
organization indicates that it reflects a natural order,
and is, therefore, impartial and neutral toward its
membership. The sentiments, desires, views, etc. of human
beings are of a secondary ontological status, and,
therefore, must always be subordinate to the action
prescribed by the objective organization. Such a view of
social organization is justifiably considered authoritarian, and will be demonstrated to be the theoretical foundation of all non-democratic forms of social organizations.

Following this, the authoritarian type of organization needs to be displaced theoretically before democratic order can take place. Theoretically, authoritarian organization is antithetical to democratic action. A democratic form of organization: 1) implies that individuals are capable of directing and even creating the patterns of interaction that constitute social organization, 2) is based on a human regulating principle, and not an objective regulating principle, and 3) is a manifestation not of the dictates of an unassailable truth or Reason, but of the human interaction and negotiation which determines what constitutes legitimate organizational behavior. A democratic organization may be viewed as a "responsive" organization since its functioning is a direct reflection or response to the mandates of those who comprise it. Clearly, in ontological terms displacement of the Cartesian dualism is a preliminary step to the theoretical development of the democratic organization.
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CHAPTER II
The Authoritarian Organization in Modern Social Thought

Introduction

The philosophers of the eighteenth and nineteenth century Enlightenment openly ignored Descartes' warning to exclude social and political phenomena from rational analysis. Along with Copernicus, Galileo, and others Descartes had demonstrated two important facts. First, a natural, universal order did exist. Second, the philosopher-scientist had only to construct a proper method for discovering this order, and an understanding of the nature and connections between all phenomena would result. The proper method, of course, was the rational (Cartesian) method modified by the empiricism of Bacon, Locke, and others. The empirical-Cartesian method, based on the logic of mathematics, prescribed the analysis of a phenomenon into its most basic parts followed by a synthetic explanation of the relationship of the components to each other and other phenomena. The proliferation of this basic scientific method helped to transform the Age of Darkness into the Age of Reason, or the Enlightenment. The theological and metaphysical superstitions of the past
could be replaced with clear, concise, scientific knowledge. It is no coincidence that many philosophies of Individualism were developed during this era. The rational method was expected to empower human beings as had no other form of analysis. Scientific knowledge of the objective, regulating forces would provide individuals with the ability to thoroughly understand the nature or laws of these forces, and, therefore, to predict what the future would demand.

This was the intellectual spirit of the time, and it is no mystery as to why the social philosophers could not resist the beckoning call of rationalism. The rational method had allowed for a fantastic productive burst of scientific-philosophic inquiry. For instance, Descartes had achieved the seemingly impossible task of synthesizing two opposing systems by implementing the logic of algebra to explain physical space, i.e., analytic geometry. Many followed this lead, and it seemed the rational method was the key to understanding the order of the entire universe. Few thinkers reinforced this message more than Isaac Newton who finally proved that nature was not a chaotic collection of random occurrences, but an ordered system operating by specific mechanistic principles. The many brilliant discoveries that had occurred in mathematics, physics and astronomy seemed to indicate that social and political
phenomena deserved the same rigorous inquiry. The social philosophers of the Enlightenment began their efforts with the goal to develop a theory of society which was no less rationalistic than the physical and natural sciences of that era. Furthermore, the numerous social and political upheavals of these centuries seemed to erase all doubt that finding the rational key to social order was the vital philosophical task of the day. The following section contains a brief overview of the kinds of social philosophies that emerged in this rational spirit.

The Social Philosophy of the Enlightenment

The social and political philosophy of the Enlightenment is perhaps best-known for its promotion of the individual as the basic datum of analysis. This Individualism, most clearly elaborated by John Locke, results in an atomistic explanation of the relationship or bond between human beings, and was undoubtedly influenced by Descartes' ontological view of the human mind. An atomistic view of human nature implies that individuals are separate, disparate parts with no fundamental unity or cohesion. This image of human nature was a drastic departure from the Scholastics view. The philosophy of Individualism implies that promoting selfish needs and wants is not a sinful act, as the Scholastics maintained, but a natural and necessary drive or instinct. This
rehabilitated human nature allowed self-interest to serve as a legitimate motive for human action. The Scholastics viewed the promotion of the self as an inherently evil deed. Self-denial and self-sacrifice were the necessary requirements for a virtuous life, since emphasis on the self was associated with worldly concerns and, therefore, contradictory to the other-worldly asceticism of the Medieval period. The popularity of the Enlightenment version of human nature was undoubtedly connected to the shifting economic character of Western Europe. The practical requirements of the rapidly growing industrial capitalism were not to be found in Scholastic philosophy. The Scholastics had distinctly identified commerce as one of the sinful results of selfishness. However, it seemed quite evident to the Enlightenment thinkers that as economic production increased so did the overall standard of living. The beneficial side effects of such progress were political and social as well as economic. The state was, increasingly, no longer simply the instrument of the monarchy used to enforce their divine rights, but a medium to ensure the civil liberties of all.

This doctrine of Individualism, however, was most evidently atomistic in character, when these philosophers tried to explain the social aspects of human existence. Logically, an atomistic view of human nature results in
social ontological nominalism, which maintains that the social whole is nothing more than the sum of the individuals who comprise it. The nominalist view is antithetical to the ontological realism which assumes the social whole is an autonomous reality. However, the rationalist philosophers, while retaining their atomistic human nature, usually developed a notion of some form of regulating principle which provided the missing cohesiveness to human existence. Theoretically this allowed them to simultaneously stress two seemingly contradictory ideas: the atomism of individual existence, and the ontological superiority of the social whole.

The social whole, therefore, was explained by the rationalists as a state in which the discrete, component parts (individuals) are bonded together by an external agent that ensures order, harmony and mutual benefit. The exact description of this external agent or regulating principle varied with each philosopher. Hobbes is well known for his rendition of the state as the mechanism of social unity that prevents the "war of all against all." Locke, Rousseau and others developed classic notions of the Social Contract as the external ordering agent with an inherent Principle of Justice organically predisposing each individual toward social cohesion. Therefore, regardless of their atomistic versions of human nature, the
ontological realism, i.e., assuming the existence of a universal regulating principle, of these philosophers is still very much intact.

The remainder of this chapter will discuss the views of many thinkers of the eighteenth and nineteenth century, with a detailed presentation of the work of Adam Smith, Auguste Comte, G. W. F. Hegel, Emile Durkheim and Karl Marx. Each of these theorists was profoundly affected by the spirit of rationalism, although there is variety in their reactions to it. These particular writers have been selected, however, for their important contributions to a sociological understanding of social organization. Many other social philosophers of this era have influenced contemporary organizational theory, but the works of Smith, Comte, Hegel, Durkheim, and Marx epitomize certain intellectual trends which are important to an understanding of the authoritarian organization.

The Social Theory of Adam Smith

As a social theorist Adam Smith has achieved an ambiguous status in the field of sociology in the United States. Few theorists have had such a profound impact on a discipline, while at the same time be so blatantly ignored. Sociology is undoubtedly "Smithian" in certain perspectives, and yet few members of the discipline laud Smith as a recognizable "Founding Father." Although Smith
is largely ignored at present, he was worth a considerable amount of discussion to early sociologists. Although their evaluation of his work disagrees, both Comte and Marx specifically identify Smith as a leading proponent of the scientific or rational study of social, political and economic phenomena. Comte praised Smith as the only political philosopher who had any "sense of what constitutes a true scientific method," while Marx criticized him as a political economist who "gave expression to the historical mission of the bourgeois period." The first American sociologists were likewise well aware of Smith's contribution to their discipline. In the third edition of *Principles of Sociology*, F. H. Giddings remarks that "were I now re-writing the sketch of the development of social theory, I think that I should indeed claim for Adam Smith the first place among sociologists." Clearly, Adam Smith developed a social philosophy which has had a great impact on the development of sociological theory. It will also be demonstrated, however, that Smith's social analysis greatly contributed to the present image of the authoritarian social organization, particularly the workplace.

As part of the Anglo-Scottish Enlightenment, Adam Smith was concerned with the major problems that vexed most social philosophers of that period. That is, the question
of the nature of human nature, and the question of the origin and maintenance of social order or social organization was the focus of much of Smith's writings. Specifically, he was especially devoted to solving the problems related to morality and moral judgement. In fact, Smith's first major work was devoted entirely to the subject. The Theory of Moral Sentiments (1759) is not as popularly known as The Wealth of Nations (1776), but in this work Smith carefully outlines his view of the nature of human nature and the basis of social life. These ideas are often thought to be the foundation of the economic principles outlined in The Wealth of Nations, and represent Smith's truly sociological position. Smith's view of human nature is atomistic, but as with most Enlightenment social philosophies, it is atomism within the contest of pre-existing parameters. For Smith, society "appears like a great, an immense machine whose regular and harmonious movements produce a thousand agreeable effects." The regular and harmonious movements, however, are dependent on a common understanding of moral action. Therefore, Smith assures that his ontology of individualism or "self-love" results not in vice, but virtue "the fine polish to the wheels of society." Smith agrees that the pursuit of self-love produced and abundance of social progress, but if self-interest were to go unchecked "a man would enter an
assembly of men as he enters a den of lions." Smith's machine analogy is only one illustration of his social ontological realist view of social organization. Throughout his work he uses both mechanistic and organic imagery to suggest that an underlying principle provides the common understanding of moral action that is required to produce social order.

To account for the "other," nonselfish aspect of individual action Smith introduces a Principle of Sympathy. Accordingly, all human beings are "endowed" with the ability to imagine themselves in the situation of others, and to profoundly identify with their expressions of joy or misery. However, the act of identification or sympathizing implies a sense of moral approval of the others action. Sympathy is not shown for all the various situations of others, and the propriety or impropriety of actions is judged by what Smith calls the General Rules of morality. These general rules are inherent in every individual, and are described by Smith as "the commands and laws of the Deity." They were "set up within us to be the supreme arbiters of all our actions." Furthermore, through the concept of the "impartial spectator," Smith actually personifies the General Rules as a "man within the breast
the great judge and arbiter." The impartial spectator may be appealed to not only as an arbiter between persons, but also as an ever-present objective viewer of the self's conduct. Therefore, the individual obeys the General Rules of morality not only to remain in accordance with the Deity's commands and avoid punishment, but also because the Rules characterize precisely how human beings naturally desire to act.

Clearly, Smith rescues his ontology based on atomism with the General Rules of morality as the all-pervasive, regulating principle of social order. However, Smith's General Rules go beyond a simplistic analysis of an a priori God, who directly dictates to humanity through various agents. The Smithian version of the universal, regulating principle is fast approaching a sort of natural religion, and is no doubt what most impressed Comte as the "nonmetaphysical" character of his social theory. Smith's Deity, Author of Nature, Great Designer, or All-Seeing Judge is considered, of course, to be the ultimate source of all social organization. However, the social is like a great machine that once created operates according to certain innate laws. The actual, everyday working of the machine may proceed without the minute to minute manipulations of its Creator. Just as the laws of mechanics govern the daily functions of an actual machine,
so the Rules of morality govern the daily functions of the social. Social organization embodies the General Rules of morality, for Smith, while the individual is endowed with certain organic drives which correspond to these Rules, and social harmony results.  

In *The Wealth of Nations* Smith outlines a basic theory of liberal capitalism, and a general model of workplace organization. It is essential to remember that Smith based his economic-political theory on his initial social (moral) theory. Many writers have neglected to explore the latter, and often read little more than simple selfishness into Smith's notion of economic self-interest. Smith does claim that the economy is based on the individual's desire to "better one's condition" or self-love, but as illustrated above many other natural propensities (e.g., the desire to what ought to be approved of) are implicated in this process. Furthermore, these propensities or natural traits are not reflexive, and must be allowed to operate freely so a spontaneous, natural, social order will emerge. Therefore, while individuals are seemingly interested only in promoting self-serving ends, the hidden organic forces, and the external legal structure ensure that these ends are actually rational in nature. That is, individuals are always, unknowingly, promoting the ends of the Regulating Principle, Reason, or in Smith's terminology
the Deity. Smith, in *The Wealth of Nations*, comments on this notion as he explains the apparently selfish act of the capitalist who invests in domestic rather than foreign industry:

> By preferring the support of domestic to that of foreign industry, he intends only his own security . . . and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention. (emphasis mine)

The social order produced by the pursuit of these economic goals is thoroughly natural, and therefore inevitable. Since, according to Smith, it is not a product of conscious, intentional human design, but emerges from a more objective source. Human action, in the pursuit of self-serving goals, is simply the medium through which Reason creates the social world. Smith further emphasizes the naturalness of social order by noting that the individual "by pursuing his own interest he frequently promotes that of society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it (emphasis mine)." Therefore, any form of direct manipulation of the social may jeopardize its natural harmony. Government, for example, should only exist to preserve the natural institutions which are defined by the rules of justice. In *The Wealth of Nations*, Smith discusses in detail the natural economic phenomena which include: private
property, free enterprise, wage labor, supply and demand laws, the accumulation of capital, and, most important to this discussion of the contemporary view of complex organizations, the division of labor.

Smith defends the complex division of labor, including the authority structure of the eighteenth century industrial factory, on the premise that it is an inevitable, natural and, therefore moral phenomenon. Smith also specifically promotes the gradual de-skilling of jobs, and the reduction of the production process into the simplest and easiest tasks. Since the structure of the division of labor in the workplace is natural any attempt to suggest an alternative framework is a contradiction to social and economic laws, and theoretically impossible.

For the purposes of the present argument it should be noted that Adam Smith attempts to comprehensively explain all human events with the same method and degree of certainty as Descartes' and Newton's explanations of mathematics and nature. Smith retains the Cartesian dualism throughout his theory, the search for a universal standard of morality is after all the major impetus for his primary work. As Salomon points out, Smith's major task was to develop a social science that would be the instrument for discovering the criteria of correct social and individual action. Smith's greatest impact on
Western society is, perhaps, his moral defense of industrial capitalism and the liberal state. Both of these structures, during Smith's lifetime, were increasingly codified and protected by the rules of justice of many Western European countries. Smith's rational analysis of these phenomena elevated them to the status of natural, objective, universal laws of human existence.

The Sociological Theory of Auguste Comte

Comte is traditionally cited as the "Father of Sociology" since he, of course, coined the term, and was one of the first theorists to explicitly outline the inquiry of the social as a scientific endeavor. Specifically, Comte was the first to systematically adapt the Cartesian method for the study of social phenomena. Many other philosophers of the Enlightenment, as noted above, utilized the rational method, but none were so forthright about their endeavors as Comte. Comte's early life and academic training was very similar to Descartes', and he specifically identifies his work as the "completion" of the Cartesian spirit. Descartes' work in mathematics and his overall method are, according to Comte, the cradle of the positive method. Comte, however, also acknowledges a debt to the philosopher Bacon for providing the content of science via empiricism, with Descartes providing the form of science via the method.
As a rationalist, social philosopher Comte wanted to provide, once and for all, a body of undisputable knowledge relating to social existence. Aron refers to this as Comte wanting to discover "ultimate truth", while Levy-Bruhl notes that Comte's primary concern was "to establish by rational means a system of universally acceptable truths concerning man, society and the world." Comte was obviously impressed with the successes of rationalism in many fields, especially the natural and physical sciences. However, if a universal order is actually present, then all subject-matter can and must be accounted for in a rational manner, and this was not being adequately accomplished in Comte's view. The political chaos of Western Europe during Comte's lifetime led him to contend that "either modern society must perish, or minds must regain their stable equilibrium by submission to common principles." The Cartesian aversion to diversity and conflict of ideas, and the development of a method which would produce this orderly, harmonious, social existence were the major focuses of Comte's work.

Historically, Comte could trace the development of the rational method by Descartes, and the subsequent modifications and adaptations of this method by various philosophers-scientists for their particular subject-matters. Each area of study required a certain
modification to the method, but its basic logic was always preserved and the results were always positive, i.e., the establishment of a body of invariable laws of the order and progress of the phenomenon under study. Furthermore, advancements in one area seemed to facilitate growth in knowledge in other areas. Eventually, Comte constructed a hierarchy of sciences. Each science in the hierarchy made a special contribution to the positive method, and provided the basis for the succeeding science. The completion of the hierarchy was the development of the science of society or sociology. This hierarchy was, of course, Comte's attempt to provide a complete rational system which encompassed all known reality. The reason why sociology was the completion of the hierarchy can be found in Comte's Law of Three Stages.

The Law of Three Stages or Periods or States is, essentially, Comte's explanation of which "common principles" individuals must be subject, if social equilibrium is to occur. In a true Cartesian style, Comte begins his system with an idealist ontology. Comte, however, substitutes a concept of Humanity for Descartes' Perfect Mind and Smith's Deity: Humanity, for Comte, is not a being or force, but it is the general term for the natural progress or evolution of the human intellect. It does not refer to any particular individual or group, but
to an abstract, universal subject. The stage or state of
Humanity then serves as an indication of the intellectual
condition of a given historical period. Humanity can not
be understood by examining the living individuals of an
era, but vice versa, since "we ought not to conceive a
whole from its parts." Comte, therefore, was one of the
Enlightenment philosophers who did not adopt the Cartesian
atomism and adhere to an individualist ontology. The
smallest unit of analysis for the Comtean sociologist is
the family (in any form), not the individual. In Comte's
social theory the individual did not exist, except as a
concept abstracted from the whole, i.e., Humanity. This,
of course, indicates that Comte adheres perfectly to social
ontological realism.

Humanity completes a series of three distinct
intellectual modes: the Theological, Metaphysical, and
Positive Stages. Each state is characterized by various
assumptions about the nature of existence. In the
Positive, and final, State "the mind has given over the
vain search over Absolute notions, the origin and
destination of the universe . . . and applies itself to the
study of laws—that is, their invariable relations of
succession and resemblance."

The Law of Humanity, which is the cornerstone of
Comte's philosophy, is the general a priori and gives
meaning to all further logical deduction and observation. This maneuver enables Comte to establish positive philosophy as a natural product of human evolution, it becomes, "the spontaneous wisdom of mankind." The legitimacy of positive knowledge rests on the fact that it was arrived at through a universal, objective method. Comte consistently implies that the content or "Doctrine" produced by any rational investigation is of a secondary importance. The primary focus is on the unity of the method, i.e., the assumption that all natural, physical and social phenomena are subject to invariable laws.

Therefore, in true Cartesian spirit positive philosophy is the result of the human mind trying to understand and adjust to the external world, which includes the Regulating Principle. External reality exists sui generis, but the imperfections of the individual mind cause all theories to only be, according to Comte, "accelerated approximations toward a reality which can never be rigorously estimated." Deductions or observations of new facts or relations between facts can always be incorporated to produce a more approximate law concerning a particular phenomenon. The addition of new facts, however, never implies a corresponding change in the approach or method of inquiry. The idea that all phenomena are subject to
invariable laws of existence is an unchallengeable assumption in Comte's social theory.

The whole of Comte's philosophy is based on the notion that a natural social order exists as a particular stage in Humanity. Humanity becomes the source of all legitimation, and the positive method becomes the source of all legitimation, and the positive method becomes the only procedure by which this source can be known. Humanity is Comte's effort to produce an objective, ahistorical basis of knowledge, and hence social order. Comte rejected personified forms of Reason, such as God, in order to thoroughly objectify its existence. Personified versions of the regulating principle were obviously anthropomorphic in character, and this smacked of subjectivity. To completely divorce his notion of Humanity from subjective individuals Comte confines his study to invariable laws, not their source or purpose, but simply their function and effects. Just as Descartes determined mathematics to be the rule of evidence by which to judge the validity of other sciences, Comte declares the positive state of Humanity to be the supreme rule of evidence of the legitimacy of beliefs, morals, institutions and organizations. The only legitimate social organizations, for Comte, are those based on ideas which were garnered through the positive method.
Hence, the ontologically superior status is given to Humanity, the invariable laws of intellectual progress, and its manifestations, i.e., positive social organizations and institutions. Humanity, as Marvin notes, is a "super-individual thing," and the basis of Comte's dualistic ontology. The dualism is also expressed in the relationship between the mind and the medium. Comte refers to the medium as that which is "capable of acting on us," and the mind as that which "is susceptible to that action." The ontological realism of this positive science is likewise quite evident. The implications of realism for social organization are made even more clear by Comte's references to the government as "the universal, necessary reaction--first spontaneous and then regulated--of the whole upon the parts." The function of the state is to "keep up the idea of the whole" through intellectual, moral, and economic regulations. Any social organization with the ability or goal to keep up the idea of the whole was granted, by Comte, a similar ontologically superior status. The subordinate individual parts must always be secondary to the idea of the whole. The individual must always comply with the demands of the superior organization, not only does this ensure social harmony, but it is in accordance with natural, universal laws of social existence.
The Social Philosophy of G. W. F. Hegel

For the purposes of this chapter Hegel's work will be considered as another example of the type of social analysis first disclosed here as Cartesianism. Hegel's work will demonstrate that this particular philosophical trend was prevalent in the German tradition as well. As a nineteenth century philosopher Hegel was searching for philosophical answers to the questions which fascinated most social thinkers of that era. The French Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, the advancements of science, and the twofold issue of social order and social progress were indeed the areas Hegel addressed in his philosophy. Furthermore, Hegel's answers to these social problems were also in tune with the Enlightenment tradition, i.e., Hegel intended his social analysis to produce absolute, rational truth. In succinct terms, for Hegel "the rational is the actual, the actual is the rational."

Hegel's philosophy was often criticized by August Comte as metaphysical in character. Hegel, however, did not feel the "scientific" nature of his philosophy was jeopardized by an admitted metaphysical basis of knowledge. For Hegel, the main thrust of philosophy was to prove that "the rational is the actual," and vice versa. That is, all existence is a manifestation of an absolute regulating principle, which, for Hegel, is the Absolute Mind or Spirit.
or Idea. Hegel perhaps best carries on the Cartesian idealism by making his philosophy a thoroughly rational and absolute idealism. Although, again, like all other followers of Descartes, Hegel safeguards his idealism from an absolute solipsism. To accomplish this Hegel invokes this notion of the Absolute Spirit.

Hegel differs, however, from the philosophers discussed above, in that he refuses to concur that the human mind is only able to know a portion or approximation of reality. Specifically, Hegel was arguing with the Kantian notion of phenomenal versus noumenal existence. For Kant certain categories of the mind allowed for human experience of the phenomenal aspects of existence. Noumenal reality exists as *ding an sich*, a thing in itself, and is purged of all human interference and interpretation. For Hegel and other German idealists all objects of knowledge were part of a dynamic process, i.e., the dialectical "unfolding" of the Absolute Spirit. The categories of the mind are, for Hegel, included as part of the Absolute Spirit and achieve an ontological status which renders them independent form individual thought. This idea of mental categories is similar to the Kantian notions, but Hegel does not portray the Absolute Spirit, or its manifestations, as a being or thing separate from the world of experience. The Absolute Idea is the world. The
categories of the mind are not simply the medium through which the mind can know reality, they are a mode of being or reality in themselves. Hegel often referred to the Absolute Spirit as an abstract, internal or inner essence as opposed to the external, concrete world.36

The Spirit is known through the never ending dialectical process, which is Hegel's logical manner of understanding or recognizing the characteristics of the Absolute Spirit in the actual (concrete existence). Hegel called this act of knowing the Spirit self-consciousness or self-reflection.37 Through self-reflection the human mind is able to understand itself (and consequently all else) as the movement of the Spirit from "absolute abstraction or universality" to "a determinancy as a content and object."38

The synthesis, or mediation, of the abstract with the determinate is, of course, self-consciousness, i.e., understanding the parts relationship to the whole. All existence could be understood as the Spirit's "return to itself" from its external manifestation. That is, by the human mind understanding the objective, abstract nature of what exists as particular objects.39 Hegel comments on the importance of this type of analysis in the Philosophy of Right:
When those who try to justify things on historical grounds confuse an origin in external circumstances with one in the concept [idea] they unconsciously achieve the very opposite of what they intend. Once the origination of an institution has been shown to be wholly to the purpose and necessary in the circumstances of the time, the demands of history have been fulfilled. But if this is supposed to pass for a general justification of the thing itself, it turns out to be the opposite, because, since those circumstances are no longer present, the institution so far from being justified has by their disappearance lost its meaning and its right.

In this passage Hegel clearly indicates that the legitimacy of social institutions must be founded on the Concept, the Absolute Idea, to ensure their objective status. Institutions and organizations based simply on the immediate needs and demands of individuals cannot be considered equally legitimate. As Stumpf notes "Hegel looked upon institutions, not as creations of man, but as the product of the dialectical movement of history, of the objective manifestation of rational reality."

In describing the three most significant institutions (the Family, Civil Society, the State) Hegel begins with a notion of ethics or morality which becomes the basis of this dialectical movement. The ethical order is objective and

... hence it posits within itself distinctions whose specific character is thereby determined by a concept, and which endow the ethical order with a stable content independently necessary and subsistent in exaltation above subjective opinion
and caprice. These distinctions are absolutely valid laws and institutions . . . hence the ethical order is freedom or absolute will as what is objective, a circle of necessity whose moments are the ethical powers which regulate the life of individuals. To these powers individuals are related as accidents to substance . . .

This quote is cited to illustrate Hegel's idea of the superiority of the Idea (as ethical order) over the individual subject. But, it is even more interesting that Hegel defines the power of the ethical order over individuals as freedom and not authority. To have one's life regulated by the Absolute Idea for Hegel is to be free. Hegel defends this position ontologically by suggesting that an individual cannot be opposed to the "absolute authority" of the ethical order since "his spirit bears witness to them as its own essence."³³

Hegel devoted a considerable amount of analysis to the workplace and corporate bureaucracy as major components of civil society. In an obviously Smithian tone, Hegel defines the division of labor as "the universal and objective element in work."³⁴ Hegel was aware of the need for an ever-increasing division of labor if industry was to progress. He explicitly states that eventually the division of labor "makes work more and more mechanical until finally man is able to step aside and install machines in his place."³⁵ Again, like Smith and Comte,
Hegel endows the division of labor in the workplace with an ontological status superior to the status of the human element.

The Corporation (as a work organization) is also given a significant place in Hegel's philosophy. The Corporation is a more "ethical ground" for business as opposed to the non-corporate workplace, because it is a unity of the particular interests and existences of its individual members, and, therefore has a universal character. Through a Corporation "subjective, self-seeking turns into a contribution to the satisfaction of the needs of everyone else." How very similar to some of Smith's notions such as the Invisible Hand. The Corporate member (at all levels) is then ethically superior to those "who work only for casual gain on single occasions," since corporate members are able to achieve personal gains while at the same time promote a universal end. The individual corporate member is not longer forced to "fend for himself" to earn a living. The Corporation "under the higher surveillance of the State" rationalizes wage earning by establishing objective criteria for the treatment of its members. Individual workers are no longer subject to the "personal opinion and contingency" of an individual employer.
The bureaucratic Corporation is the rational bridge between the State and Civil Society. The bureaucracy objectifies the Corporation, it injects a form of absolute universality into the workplace by bringing it closer to the State. As Marx has said of Hegel's work on this topic: "The Corporation is civil society's attempt to become the State; but the bureaucracy is the State which has really made itself into civil society." Hegel's position on the organization of the workplace is that its structures must embody the demands of the State, to ensure the workplace's objectivity, rationality and universality. The bureaucracy, of course, is the mechanism through which these conditions are accomplished.

Hegel analyzes many other social, political and economic phenomena, such as private property, patriarchy, inheritance laws, the Legislature, and the Constitution, in a similar manner. However, whatever the subject of Hegel's analyses the end result is the same: social, political and economic institutions and organizations are legitimized only by their relationship to the State, which, of course, is the actuality of the Absolute Idea or Reason. The institutions and organizations are also the actuality of the rational, and maintain an objective existence independent of human beings. Human action for Hegel, as with Smith and
Comte, can never be exalted above the authority of the rational aspects of social existence.

The Sociological Theory of Emile Durkheim

In any consideration of the history of the social ontological realist view of organization, Emile Durkheim's sociological work is an example par excellence. Durkheim was disturbed by the great political and social upheavals of his day, and like Comte, felt that sociology could indeed discover the order missing from social life. Social diversity was welcome as long as it was possible to establish a solid foundation of social or moral order upon which all other actions, thoughts, and feelings could be based. Durkheim, like the other social philosophers in the Cartesian-rationalistic tradition, searches for a Regulating Principle, an undeniable, common ground of knowledge that serves as the legitimation for all human action. Also, like Descartes, Durkheim outlines his method carefully in a single work, and attempts to develop this method as one suitable for discovering the presupposed natural order of the world.

The Rules of Sociological Method, then is similar to Descartes' work in more than just its title. Durkheim begins this treatise by stating that "our principle objective is to extend scientific rationalism to human behavior." It might be said that at the time Durkheim
wrote this the entire history of French social philosophy had been devoted to this same task, but he concluded that no earlier attempt at a science of society had engendered any substantial success. The need to develop a science which would produce clear and concise knowledge of social organization was still of immediate importance. According to Durkheim the failure of previous thinkers to develop rational, scientific knowledge of the social was due only to their lack of understanding of the true nature of what constituted social existence. As noted above, if order is assumed to exist in an universal, ahistorical, absolute manner, then knowledge of that order must logically also be purged of any historical, particular elements. The method, therefore, must produce the type of knowledge that is congruous with the nature of what is being studied. For Durkheim this meant a clear and concise definition of both the subject matter and method of sociological research was required, before any progress toward a rational basis of social order could be accomplished.

For Durkheim the human mind cannot serve as the basis of social organization, since the mind (individual or general) can only contain ideas of social reality, and these do not constitute a reality in themselves. Ideas are only "representations" of social reality, and express it "more or less exactly." Ideas must never be confused
with reality, rather the former must proceed from the latter. For Durkheim the ontological basis of reality, or "all objects of knowledge," are "things;" objective, independent, external facts. Things are what exist **sui generis**. Social order, therefore, is constituted of social things or social facts. Social facts are Reason to Durkheim, and consequently serve as the basis of all legitimate forms of thinking, feeling and acting. Social facts and their collective forms, then, are the unique data of the sociologist. The task of the sociologist is to develop "lay notions" into "scientifically legitimate" knowledge of the social, the collective. The conditions which allow for the development of such knowledge are outlined by Durkheim as three principal rules or corollaries of sociological research.

The first rule is stated simply: "All preconditions must be eradicated." For Durkheim this first rule constitutes "the basis of all scientific method." In essence this statement calls for a rejection of all nonscientific concepts, i.e., all knowledge arrived at by a method other than which is outlined here. The similarity of this to Descartes' first rule of method is not coincidental. Durkheim states that "The logical doubt of Descartes is, in essence, only an application of it [Durkheim's first rule]." Furthermore, "the two great
doctrines" of Bacon and Descartes are cited as the basis of this "essential point" of social investigation. According to Durkheim, then, in order to investigate the social the sociologist has to "repudiate resolutely" any notions which are not arrived at through the scientific-rational method.

The second rule of method, assuming all nonscientific notions are purged, involves the choosing or defining of an appropriate topic for a particular research project. Durkheim has already assumed social things are the general subject matter of sociology, the second rule suggests the need to define the particular phenomenon under investigation, e.g., the family, suicide, etc. Therefore, "The subject-matter of every sociological study should comprise a group of phenomena defined in advance by certain common external characteristics, and all phenomena so defined should be included in this group." With this second rule Durkheim implies two ideas which reinforce the dominant ontological status of social facts. First, the sociologist must define phenomena by their "external" qualities since the human mind can only grasp the exterior or surface qualities of social reality. For Durkheim, "deeper layers of reality" or an "essence" of social facts exists that the human mind is unable to penetrate. Second, since social reality is independent of every
individual mind a method inquiry must "establish contact with things," and sense perception is the most adequate procedure for accomplishing this. However, the spirit of Descartes lives along side the spirit of Bacon in Durkheim's sociology, and like Comte he was always somewhat mistrustful of sensory perception. Therefore, "from sensation all general ideas flow," but "sensation may be easily subjective." Hence, the objectivity of all sense perceptions must be ensured or sociological research will become nothing more than the "confused, fleeting, subjective impressions" of various individual researchers. Once an object of perception is realized as fixed, stable and constant its objective nature is established, and such a phenomenon "is what it is, and there are no tow ways of looking at it."

Following from this principle, Durkheim states the third rule as:

When the sociologist undertakes the investigation of some order of social facts, he must endeavor to consider them from an aspect that is independent of their individual manifestations. This corollary reiterates the notion that social facts literally have a separate, *sui generis* existence from humankind. Individual manifestations only "partly reproduce a social model." There is diversity in the reproduction of the social model that can be witnessed in
individual consciousnesses, groups or societies, only because a variety of external conditions affect these phenomena. Complete and absolute uniformity of all that exists as social is "utterly impossible," but "All sociological phenomena (as well as biological phenomena) can assume different forms in different cases while still conserving their essential characteristics." The social ontological realist view of social order is quite evident in this notion of the hidden, unreachable, but coercive nature of social facts. For Durkheim what exists as actual, historical human action, consciousnesses, societies, etc., and what the mind can comprehend as social is at best only fragmentary, since the Social exists in toto in a realm uncontaminated and unapproachable by human consciousness. In a very Comtean manner, Durkheim remarks that by establishing sociological inquiry on the "solid ground" of his method it will then "be possible to push research further, and by successive approximations, to encompass, little by little, this fleeting reality, which the human mind will never, perhaps, be able to grasp completely."  

In a genuine Enlightenment style Durkheim contends that a stable, permanent, universal social order was by implication a morale order. Religion had traditionally contained the necessary moral prescriptions for society,
and if science was going to replace religion as the source of true knowledge it would have to produce valid results for all areas of social life, moral judgement included. The development of a true sociological method will allow Durkheim to "vindicate the legitimate rights of reason . . . without reverting to ideology." Since social facts are the "pre-established harmony" they, of course, are the immediate source of moral assumptions. The sociologist therefore is very much a discoverer of the Moral as well as the Social. Throughout many of his writings Durkheim draws a connection between the frequency or stability of a social phenomenon and its morality. In reference to this issue Durkheim states: "It would be incomprehensible if the most widespread forms of social organization would not at the same time be, at least in their aggregate, the most advantageous," their "greater frequency . . . is . . . a proof of their superiority." The objective forms of organization, then, constitute the moral fabric of the society. They, indeed, exist as social facts, and, thence, are autonomous and exert authority over the individual.

However, in all Durkheim's efforts to construct an authoritarian conception of social organization, he many times comments on the "autonomy" or "originality" of individual expression which must not be violated.
Durkheim's many efforts to resolve this contradiction between the coercive social fact, and the autonomous individual reveal, however, further proof of his undaunted social ontological realism:

Because beliefs and social practices thus come to us from without, it does not follow that we receive them passively or without modification . . . we individualize them and impart to them more or less personal characteristics . . . There is not conformity to social convention that does not comprise an entire range of individual shades. It is nonetheless true that this field of variations is a limited one. It verges on the non-existence or is very restricted in that circle of religious and moral affairs where deviation easily becomes crime. It is wider in all that concerns economic life. But, sooner or later, even in the latter instance, one encounters the limit that cannot be crossed. (emphasis mine)

Hence, Durkheim posits individual autonomy within certain predetermined parameters. A certain amount of latitude of individual expression is possible without invalidating the authority of the social organization as fact. Therefore, the tension between the individual and the Social is a natural relationship, and discovering the boundaries or limits to personal autonomy is liberating rather than repressive. At the level of the individual person this conflict is played out as "the painful character of the dualism of human nature." Even though social facts are personalized by individual interpretation they still, of course, retain an essence of their original nature which
constitutes their objectivity. And, it is the presence of the Social that ensures an objective aspect of each individual, and predisposes him/her toward moral action. Durkheim describes the personal versus impersonal objective aspects of human nature as two "beings" that comprise each individual person.

The personal being is pure ego, the thoroughly human, subjective aspect of the individual. The impersonal being, however, represents something quite different:

There is another being in us, however, which knows things sub specie aeternitis, as if it were participating in some thought other than its own, and which, in its acts, tends to accomplish ends that surpass its own . . . our inner life has something that is like a double center of gravity. On the one hand is our individuality— and, more particularly, our body in which it is based; on the other is everything in is that expresses something other than ourselves.

There is an obvious similarity here with Smith's "impartial spectator" as the organic basis of morality.

The implications of Durkheim's sociology for an analysis of the workplace indicate a thoroughly authoritarian view of such an organization. Social Facts, or the Social Model, represent for Durkheim Reason, a regulatory, legitimizing agent of human action. Social organization is granted the authority to determine the legitimacy of social thought and conduct, since it is the historical manifestation of the Social Model. Therefore,
the needs or interests of the Social Organization (the whole) are not necessarily the needs and interests of the individual (the part), but the needs of the former must always supersede those of the latter. Indeed, Durkheim posits this relationship as the source of all morality. The economic division of labor, then, is merely a specific form of the subordination of the particular to the general, the part to the whole. Therefore, the traditional, authoritarian structure of the workplace, for Durkheim, becomes ontologically the basis of all morality, order and harmony within such a context. To suggest the organization relinquish its power to the individuals it surpasses would be to subvert the natural equilibrium of the Social Model, and ontologically an impossibility for Durkheim.

The Social Theory of Karl Marx

Obviously many other social theorists, instead of Smith, Comte, Hegel and Durkheim, could have been presented here as representative of the school of social ontological realism. Ricardo, Mill, Fichte, Montesquieu and Spencer are just a few mentionables whose theoretical positions closely resemble those of Smith, Comte, Hegel, and Durkheim. However, the particular theories presented here were chosen either for epitomizing the social realist position, or for their historical influence on contemporary organizational theory. This is likewise the case with the last theorist
to be presented in this chapter, Karl Marx. Marx's work is presented in part as a summary to the other theorists since much of his writings constitute an oppositional critique of their perspectives on social organization. Furthermore, Marx's influence on a particular school of organizational literature is undeniable, and any attempt to present an analysis of the theoretical underpinnings of democratic organization would be remiss if it did not include his perspective.

Marx often constructed his ideas through an ongoing polemic against other social theories. Marx's earliest works are characterized by his criticism of Hegel, and the school of Absolute Idealism in general. As his work progresses, however, the critique of Hegel becomes a critique of any theory or perspective which posits an objective, Regulating Principle as the entity to which human individuals must be subordinate. Marx's approach to Hegel was via the philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach and his "transformative method." Feuerbach accused Hegel of inverting reality with the logic of the movement of the Absolute Idea. For Feuerbach the human element produced the Idea and not vice versa. As Marx commented on this:

The important thing is that Hegel, at all times, makes the Idea the subject and makes the proper and actual subject . . . the predicate.
He has made the subject of the idea into a product and predicate of the Idea. The consequences of this inverted reality are that all the "rich, living, sensuous, concrete activity" of human existence is reduced to "its mere abstraction." In Hegel's logic, and implied in the assumptions of Smith, Comte and Durkheim, the individual can become real, that is objective, only by denying all that is "actual, sensuous, real, finite, and particular," i.e., for Marx all that is human. Here Marx is criticizing all those theories which debase the human condition by subjecting it to a nonhuman, ontologically superior force. This criticism, originally directed toward Hegel, can be found throughout Marx's works, and constitutes the genuine "radical" character of his theory. Marx defined this radicalness himself:

To be radical is to grasp matters at the root. But for man the root is man himself. . . . the critique of religion ends in the doctrine that man is the supreme being for man; thus it ends with the categorical imperative to overthrow all conditions in which man is a debased, enslaved, neglected, contemptible being.

However, in order to avoid Feuerbach's error of developing a materialist, but still abstract ontology, Marx was sure to emphasize that he assumes all human existence is based on "real, historical man," "real life," "the conscious being," "the real, living individuals" and "their life-process." Real, conscious,
living individuals and their life-processes are what constitute for Marx the essence, or nature, of humankind.\textsuperscript{91} Marx elaborated the "life-process" in terms of material and spiritual production, the state of society, and human consciousness.

First, in terms of production, all individuals are faced with a common problem, i.e., they "must be in a position to live in order to be able to make history."\textsuperscript{92} Human life can only be maintained first through production that satisfies basic physical needs (food, shelter, clothing, etc.). The satisfaction of basic needs always implies the creation of new, more complex (spiritual) needs, since "man produces even when he is free from physical need and only truly produces in freedom therefrom."\textsuperscript{93} Following this, as individuals "daily recreate their own life" so do they begin to "propagate their own kind."\textsuperscript{94} These three acts, then, constitute the productive element of the life-process. They are not three separate stages of development, but three aspects, or characteristics, of "the production of life" and occur simultaneously.\textsuperscript{95}

Second, the state of society, or a particular form of social organization, always accompanies the production of life. For Marx the individual is continuously in relationship with another, and this indicates the social
character of human nature. A social relationship, then, denotes the cooperation of several individuals, no matter under what conditions, in what manner and to what end." It is quite clear, however, that the manner, degree and form of cooperation facilitates varying quantities and qualities of production. Hence, Marx commented that "this mode of cooperation is itself a productive force" or mode of production.

Third, the cooperativeness of individuals in their production of life also indicates that the individual is a "conscious species-being." Through the life-process individuals knowingly recognize themselves as the ultimate source of all existence. This means that the individual is characterized as part of the human species not only because of certain physical traits, but also because the individual is consciously, intentionally capable of the production and reproduction of life. "Life engendering life" is "the whole character of the species." And, because the individual views him/herself "as a universal and therefore a free being" then the individual is also a species-being. The life-process, or praxis of the conscious, historical human being is the essence, the source, the legitimation of all human action.

Therefore, Marx assumes the foundation of all social existence is the producing, social, conscious being, and,
therefore, the image of the relationship of individuals to the productive mechanisms in any society is most important in his inquiries. Marx admitted that certain aspects of the theories of Smith and Hegel were extremely insightful, especially their analysis of labor, or human productive capabilities, as the source of all economic value. But, while Smith and Hegel developed a labor theory of value, the human individual was portrayed more like the working part of a machine than a conscious creator of value. Hence, many political economists were too eager to inflate the life-process of the capitalist system to the status of a reality sui generis. For Marx, then, the theories of Smith, Comte, Hegel and Durkheim were more correctly ideologies, as opposed to social philosophies. Marx used the term ideology to denote a viewpoint which articulated the existence of a particular social group as if that existence were universal or objective in nature. Parekh defines Marx's definition of ideology quite succinctly:

It [ideology] universalizes the condition of existence and form of thought of a specific social group and directly, or indirectly, recommends them as the only basis upon which a rational social order could be constituted.\textsuperscript{103}

It seemed clear to Marx that to a certain extent the theories mentioned above did little more than offer an abstract, theoretical justification for the existing status quo.\textsuperscript{104} There were certain writers who could obviously be
identified as the "hired prize-fighters" of the capitalists, but Marx was also aware that many "bourgeois apologists" were genuinely naive about the ideological character of their theories. Their presentation of a universal, objective basis of social order was sincere in that they truly understood social organization to exist in such a manner. For Marx this misunderstanding of the proper ontological significance of the human being, and the willingness to inflate the bourgeois life-process to an universal standard of social organization was evidence of the alienated or "estranged being" that had emerged in societies based on non-communal forms of production. For Marx the species-being becomes an alienated being when the true "human possibilities" are not realized or understood. That is, when individuals do not, for a variety of reasons, recognize themselves as creators and transformers of the world.

The rational, ontological realist theories are, for Marx, both cause and effect of the alienated form of human existence. Many political economists, for example, recognized the condition of workers which Marx referred to as alienation. However, they portrayed this situation not as a consequence of a specific form of production, social organization and consciousness, but as the only legitimate form of life-process. Again, Marx cites this as the
ideological character of these theories. In *Capital* Marx accuses these economists of portraying the capitalist life-process "naively . . . as a social law of Nature;"\(^{107}\) as a "natural form," and a "self-evident necessity imposed by Nature."\(^{108}\) Marx also charges that the "scientific economy" of Smith and Ricardo

\[
\text{... confines itself to systematizing in a pedantic way, and proclaiming for everlasting truths, the trite ideas held by the self-complacent bourgeoisie with regard to their own world, to them the best of all possible world.}\]

In Marx's position, therefore, even the subjugation of the individual is conceptualized as a human creation. Therefore, the "cause" of the human being's inability to be superior to the external world or objective reality is "not god, not nature, but only man himself can be this alien power over man."\(^{110}\) The species-being is the source of all that exists, including its own domination. The ideologies of the rationalists, however, portray the subordinate position of humankind as a natural, inevitable harmony the source of which is, of course, absolute Reason. The differences between these rational ideologies and Marx's arguments can be further illustrated through a discussion of the relationship of human beings to nature, and the division of labor.

In the theories of Smith, Comte, Hegel, and Durkheim, nature is usually posited as the perfect actuality of
Reason, since it can never misinterpret or resist Reason's demands. The natural order is often used as a perfect model of social organization, since the laws of social order should be as invariable as the laws of nature. The forces of nature (chemical, physical, biological, etc.) are thought to directly affect the human condition, and, in general nature is portrayed as objective, ahistorical and external to human existence.

Marx was well aware of this nature versus human beings dualism, and he resolved it through the development of what he called naturalist-humanism and humanist-naturalism. The terms nature and human are purposely interchanged in Marx's theory to imply the co-constituting, as opposed to dualistic, nature of their relationship. Marx elaborates this co-constitutive ontology as follows: First, nature is not viewed as superior or opposed to the human condition. For Marx, nature is the material of labor, and therefore, historically develops a human essence. The individual "starts, controls and regulates" the transformation of nature into a "humanized nature" which always bears the impression of the species-being. Second, Marx refers to nature as the individual's "inorganic body," and states the idea that: "Man lives on nature—means that nature is his body, with which he must remain in continuous interchange if he is not to die." Marx portrays the individual not
as inferior or subject to the demands of nature. Nature is both the source of the materials which individuals transform to fulfill their simple, physical and more complex spiritual needs, and the historical product of human action.\textsuperscript{114}

Accordingly, Marx understood the subversion of this dualism (nature vs. human) to be the key to subverting all other forms of ontological dualism. For example, social organization or society, for Marx, "is the unity of being of man with nature."\textsuperscript{115} The individual is not opposed to the social, in Marx's theory, nor is the concept "species-being" an abstract idea of a collective of individuals or a general, universal being. Social organization is not "an abstraction vis-a-vis the individual. The individual is the social being . . . man's individual and species life are not different."\textsuperscript{116} Therefore, Marx always portrays the individual as "subjectively and objectively, human," i.e., socially human.\textsuperscript{117} Every individual is simultaneously particular and general, part and whole.\textsuperscript{118} Durkheim's "painful dualism" does not exist for Marx.

Therefore, a notion of the general good, based on an abstract principle, is not invoked by Marx to discredit the legitimacy of any individual interest or good. It is clear that the subversion of these dualisms in Marx's work indicates that his position cannot be properly categorized
ontologically as social nominalism or social realism. For Marx, the individual is always the social being, neither a solitary atom bound to others by organic drives and unseen forces, or a simple part of a more, complex, superior whole.

The division of labor in society, like all other aspects of social organization, was viewed by the rationalists as a natural, objective development of social progress. Therefore, it provides the basis for morality as well. Marx considered the division of labor as the foundation for the alienation of the species-being, including the development of the ideologies which justified such as estranged existence. Marx argues the development of abstract social ontologies, the scientific rational method, and the various forms of private property could not have been possible without the basic division of mental and physical labor. This distinction for Marx was antecedent to the development of the mind-body dualism.

As can be expected Marx's critique of Smith's and Hegel's view of the division of labor is focused on these theorists' presentation of the division of labor found in capitalist manufacturing as an objective, universal and natural phenomenon. For Marx, the complex division of labor is not a natural occurrence, nor is it universal or ahistorical. For Marx the division of labor in the
workplace is "a special creation of the capitalist mode of production alone,"¹⁷⁹ and "implies the undisputed authority of the capitalist over men."¹²⁰ The division of labor also results in the cooperation of workers appearing not as their own species-power, but as the "production power of capital" itself.¹²¹ Marx further comments on this effect of the division of labor:

Because this power costs capital nothing, and because, on the other hand, the labourer himself does not develop it before his labour belongs to capital, it appears as a power with which capital is endowed by Nature¹²² productive power that is immanent in capital.

Marx referred to this distortion of the source of the power of production as the "fetishism of capital," or the universalization of a particular historical form.¹²³ It is also the alienation of the human being from its own species par excellence. For Marx, in the workplace the worker is dominated not by capitalists personally, therefore implying an oppressive but human relationship. The subordination, rather, is through capital, a thing, and the organization of the workplace itself (the natural division of labor). What is merely a thing (capital) produced daily by the creative power of workers is personified, given the status of a superior being. While what is truly superior (the human being) is reduced to a mere material existence. The traditional organization of the workplace is, for Marx, the actual manifestation of the rationalists theoretical
distortion of the role and capabilities of the individual, the species-being.

Conclusion

In final summation, the opposition of Marx to the theories of Smith, Comte, Hegel and Durkheim is based on those theorists recognition of an abstract, Regulating Principle which serves as the legitimation of all human thought and action. The workplace as envisaged by these theorists is sustained not by those who comprise it, but on the basis of its relationship to an abstract concept of Reason. Those members of the organization who are able to gain legitimate (scientific) knowledge of Reason may direct and control the workplace in a supposedly impartial and disinterested (and hence moral) manner. The authority of these knowledgeable organizational members is based on objective not personal claims. It is their access to Reason, not personal factors, which generates their authority. Hence, the particular or personal interests, needs, demands, sentiments, etc. of the members of the workplace can never be exalted, to use Comte's and Durkheim's term, above the general interests supposedly promoted by the organization. Furthermore, any appeals or demands which subvert or contradict these organizational
interests are impotent; unable to affect any action since they are irrational, and, therefore, illegitimate and unjustifiable.

Marx offers a radically different conceptualization of the relationship between social phenomena and individuals. The life-process or praxis, for Marx, is the supreme criteria or legitimation for human thought and action. Human existence is legitimized not by reference to a super-human thing or principle, but through the human interaction which takes place as individuals live out their praxis. A workplace, for Marx, is the embodiment of the consciousnesses and productive powers of the social beings who comprise it, not the actuality of an abstract force. The traditional, authoritarian organization, in a Marxian analysis, exists not through the authority of Reason, but through human relationships, social interaction, i.e., one social group has been able, through various means, to dominate others in the workplace and other social organizations. Marx criticizes and calls for the destruction of all authoritarian forms of workplace organization, again, not by appeals to a master-concept or principle, but by demonstrating how this type of organization results in the alienation of the species-being. The point must be stressed that in Marx's ontology
the life-process of the social being is the only criteria for evaluating the legitimacy of social phenomena.

This "non-rational" organization of the workplace, therefore, is the elementary foundation of the democratic workplace. If workers are going to be able to play a significant role in the creation of the form and content of the workplace, it must be a basic assumption that individuals are, indeed, capable of this type of power over the organization. Reason, or any form of Regulating Principle, cannot be posited as having any legitimacy or authority within social organization. Otherwise, workplace democracy will become nothing more than an attempt to superficially modify what already exists *sui generis*. 
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CHAPTER III

Formal versus Substantive Rationality: A Weberian Analysis of the Authoritarian Organization

Introduction

The primary focus of this work has been to explore the theoretical underpinnings of a particular form of social organization, namely the authoritarian-bureaucratic organization of the workplace. In the preceding chapters the works of four social theorists, which epitomized the authoritarian rendition of social organization, were discussed; and an alternative view was presented for contrast. In presenting the theoretical perspectives of Adam Smith, Auguste Comte, G.W.F. Hegel and Emile Durkheim certain philosophical assumptions concerning the nature of human existence and association were demonstrated as resulting in an ontological denial of the autonomy of human beings. Each of these theorists developed a unique concept of a superior extra-human basis of social order. These conceptions ranged historically from anthropomorphized supra-beings to a discovery of the natural laws of social development which regulate the evolution of societies. However, in general, the Regulating Principle could be
referred to as Reason, and the accompanying theoretical perspective as Rationalism. In addition, each Rationalist theorist developed a unique method of inquiry which would allow investigators to gain insight into the cohesive force(s) (Reason) which allows society to function in an orderly manner. Each methodology, furthermore, was assumed to be rational and scientific in nature. In essence, however, the theories of Smith, Comte, Hegel and Durkheim promoted the idea that a basic ontological dualism underpins human existence. The fundamental consequence of such a theoretical assumption is that the objectivity embodied in social organization prevents such a phenomenon from being affected by the claims or demands of the mere transitory, individual, i.e., the subjective.

Karl Marx's theory of the nature of social organization was also presented in Chapter Two as a general critique of the Rationalist perspectives. Marx portrayed the individual as a social being, i.e. a being who is simultaneously subjective and objective. Social intercourse, for Marx, becomes the ultimate source of reality. The presentation of Marx's ideas also demonstrated: 1) the theoretical implications of promoting a "de-humanized" image of social organization; and 2) the
preliminary theoretical shifts that will have to be accomplished if human beings are to be empowered over the authoritarian workplace.

Chapter Three will present a more detailed discussion of these issues via the sociological theory of Max Weber. Weber's name is ubiquitous to the study of bureaucracy, the epitome of the authoritarian organization as described thus far. However, this essay will illustrate that Weber, through his writings on bureaucracy, was offering a sophisticated critique of the ontological-epistemological assumptions which underpin this form of social organization. In opposition to most traditional evaluations perhaps Weber's most important sociological contributions are his identification of the social implications of the rationalization of human thought and action; and his often tacit description of the theoretical alternatives to this orientation. The following chapter, then, will present Weber's position on: 1) the nature of social organization; 2) the corresponding nature of sociological science; 3) the definition and implications of a rationalized view of social order; 4) the structure of an authoritarian organization; and 5) the subversive and empowering affect of "substantive rationality."
Sociology as an Interpretive Science

As with the other social theorists presented in this work, Weber's notions of the nature of social organization can be demonstrated most effectively by delving into his discussion of the nature of sociological theory and research. Throughout his academic career Weber was entangled in various debates and arguments concerning the correct epistemological/methodological perspective which should be adopted to investigate and explain social phenomena. The Rationalist social theorists argue that social phenomena could be approached only in a scientific manner, as if they were identical ontologically to all other forms of nature. Weber and his colleagues were convinced that the human aspect of the social was unique to all other forms of existence. Consequently, this unique quality of social reality demanded a similarly singular method of inquiry. It is through many of these methodological debates that Weber articulated his own theoretical position, particularly as it contrasts with a strictly rationalist perspective.

In spite of Weber's lucid account of his assumptions of the nature of social organization, his work has often been characterized as a traditional Enlightenment philosophy of Individualism, or social ontological nominalism. However, Weber's demand that the individual
serve as the point of departure for sociological analysis is the only commonality he shares with the Enlightenment Individualists. The social ontological nominalist theories portrayed the individual as a discrete, isolated atom or component part who was motivated only by instincts of self-interest. The social aspects of human existence could be explained ontologically only via the introduction of an external, objective ordering agent, i.e. Reason. Social nominalist theories merely illustrate the important of self-interest as the motivation necessary to maintain the social whole. The individual was not attributed any ontological autonomy and, therefore, continued to be subjected to the power of the Regulating Principle.

In this sense, Weber cannot be properly classified as a social theorist promoting the traditional Enlightenment rendition of Individualism. Weber does indeed insist that social investigation proceed from the level of the actual individual, but this is because Weber understands the individual to be ontologically superior to any social structure. For Weber human beings are the only regulating force behind any particular social order. Weber refers to the individual as "the upper limit and the sole carrier of meaningful conduct." Therefore, interaction between persons becomes the sole mechanism for creating legitimate organization. Accordingly, one of the major implications
of this theoretical stance is that individuals' beliefs and images concerning the nature of the social world must be a focal point of analysis. If human interaction (social action) is the only legitimizing agent for developing historical forms of social organization, then the motives and meanings which constitute and orient such action are the primary regulators of social reality. The role of sociology as a discipline or science, according to Weberian tenets, is to gain an understanding of human meanings and the resulting images which shape the social world. This is why Weber developed an Interpretive not a Rationalist sociological theory.

In early writings Weber formulated the following definition of sociology:

Sociology (in the sense in which this highly ambiguous word is used here) is a science concerning itself with the interpretive understanding of social action, and thereby with a causal explanation of its course and consequences.

An interpretive science is substantially different from a rational science, or in correct Weberian terminology, a formal-rational science. Although Weber may use a phrase like "causal explanation," he is not suggesting, as Durkheim would, that such an endeavor would include searching for the Objective or Universal cause of a social phenomenon. When Weber is using sociology as a tool for
arriving at a "causal explanation" of the "courses and consequences" of social action the following assumptions are in operation:

First, social action is defined as occurring when "the acting individual attaches a subjective-meaning to his behavior." The term "subjective meaning" is crucial to Weberian analysis. Weber's definition of this term implies a thoroughly non-dualistic ontological basis for human action. For Weber describing a meaning as subjective is to imply that this phenomenon has a thoroughly human origin, and that this origin serves as the only possible criterion for the ontological validity and legitimacy of the meaning in question. A subjective-meaning cannot be judged true or false in an Objective or Metaphysical sense. Weber posits human/subjective meaning as the source of legitimate social organization. According to Weber, social processes and phenomena are "intelligible or understandable" only in relation to a human/subjective context.

Second, social action is predicated on the "motives" of the acting individual. Weber uses the term "motives," again not in a psychological sense, but as follows:

A motive is a complex of subjective-meaning which seems to the actor himself or to an observer an adequate ground for the conduct in question.
The social world exists as a result of the meanings and images that individuals have created and continually use as a basis or ground for legitimate conduct. These complexes of subjective-meanings are the underlying principles or beliefs which sustain historically any particular form of social organization.

Third, social action "takes account of the behavior of others and is thereby oriented in its course." The individual is always inter-acting, i.e., always acting in the context of other individuals and their subjective-meanings. Subjective-meanings and social interaction are simultaneously co-constituting. Interaction is directed by meanings which interturn are restructured or reconstituted by social action. Although Weber has often been classified as an ontological Idealist, similar to Descartes and Kant, his notion of subjective-meaning never implies the Rationalist view that Ideas are isolated, pure concepts which exist as an objective sphere or reality. Subjective-meanings are the images and beliefs which emerge from the interaction of real persons, not the embodiment of Reason, or the in vacuo psychological perceptions of isolated individuals. Subjective-meanings or inter-subjective-meanings are the result of individuals creation and re-creation of social reality via their interaction.
Therefore, a Weberian casual explanation entails an interpretation or *verstehen* of the specific subjective-meanings/motives that have sustained or mandated certain actions.\(^{11}\) For Weber, the precision of sociological knowledge is measured only in terms of "the degree of adequacy on the level of meaning."\(^{12}\) The acting individual's complex or meaning prescribes various forms of legitimate conduct, and the nature of the many aspects of this reality. For example, according to Weber, individuals may view a collectivity such as an institution or organization as something "actually existing," and therefore such phenomena would have a "causal influence" on the action of these "real individuals."\(^{13}\) However, in sociological terms an institution or organization is properly understood "only as a certain kind of development of actual or possible social actions of individual persons," and not as an ontologically superior entity, i.e., actually existing.\(^{14}\) With these statements Weber demonstrates that social reality is created and sustained by various subjective-meanings, and that the content of these meanings truly defines all aspects of this reality. This includes assumptions concerning the nature of the relationship between the individual and social reality itself. This theoretical position is very similar to Marx's idea that even an oppressive, authoritarian, social
order achieves its status only through the creative power of human beings. Subjective-meanings which deny this creative power and promote an image of the individual as transitory, inferior and powerless (in Marx's terms ideologies) are quite possible as illustrated by the Rationalist social theorists. However, in Weber's view, regardless of the resultant social organization, human subjective-meanings are always the original "causal influence."

As an effort to expand on this idea that social organization is the result of actual or possible actions, Weber developed the ideal type as a tool for sociological analysis. To Weber outlining the consequences, i.e., the images and actions, of certain meanings was an important and valuable task for the sociologist. Weber comments that it is:

15... necessary for the sociologist to formulate pure ideal types of the corresponding forms of actions which in each case involve the highest degree of logical integration by virtue of their complete adequacy on the level of meaning. 16

Ideal types are not standard formula of the optimal or objective criteria against which the sociologist compares all existing beliefs and meanings. The Weberian sociologist should not attempt to: "grasp historical reality in abstract, general formulae but in concrete genetic sets of relations which are inevitably of a
specifically unique and individual character.\textsuperscript{17} Furthermore, ideal types are developed from the actual meanings and actions of the persons under investigation. Weber utilized these tools of social analysis to illustrate and organize the dynamic process of social creation. Ideal types also demonstrate the social consequences of specific subjective-meanings. For Weber, if ideal types are not formulated within the framework of a specific, historical, subjective context, then they are devoid of meaning," and sociologically useless.\textsuperscript{18} This method of developing ideal types from sociological inquiry was demonstrated in Weber's many investigations of "real individuals."

Weber's social analysis focused always on the question, How can the existence of a particular form of social organization be explained sociologically?\textsuperscript{19} Weber attempted to answer this question by investigating the relationship between actions and beliefs,\textsuperscript{20} and maintaining that a sociological definition "can be attempted, if at all, only at the conclusion of a study."\textsuperscript{21} These remarks are a logical consequence of Weber's idea that individuals' subjective-meanings underpin all social reality. However, Weber was also interested in discovering those subjective-meanings that seemed to be most significant in terms of the influence with which individuals have endowed them. Weber termed these powerful sets of subjective-meanings the
"Spirit,"\textsuperscript{22} "Ethos"\textsuperscript{23} or "Weltanschauung"\textsuperscript{24} (world-view) of a social organization. A "world-view" is constituted of the most fundamental and compelling meanings and beliefs. In one sense a world-view demands certain actions, and serves as a measure of the validity of all conduct and thought. Weber warns that in certain historical instances a world-view appears as "an immense cosmos . . . an unalterable order of things."\textsuperscript{25} However, a world-view is still merely a specific set of subjective-meanings which have, of course, originated in the interaction of real individuals. The process by which a spirit is able to attain such a powerful, objective statues is the focus of the majority of Weber's investigations of Western society. Weber contended that Western society had developed a unique world-view, and this, naturally, resulted in a form of organization that is equally unique in structure.

Formal Rationality as a World-View

In order for a particular set of subjective-meanings to sustain a stable, continuous form of social organization, it must become "a mass phenomenon,"\textsuperscript{26} a "peculiar ethic,"\textsuperscript{27} i.e., a world-view. Obviously, the life-span and pervasiveness of a form of organization will depend on the actual number of individuals whose interactions are providing its sustenance. However, Weber also concluded that a form of organization which was
legitimated by a genuine Ethos—"a definite standard of life claiming ethical sanction"—would be able to dominate all other competing claims of legitimate order. In this sense Weber is able to introduce a moral or ethical aspect of social reality. However, even a morally reified social organization is still viewed as the product of human action, not a master-concept or principle. Weber is merely illustrating the effects of attaching a moral prescript to a form of social organization. However, "The origin (of a common way of life) is what really needs explanation." The world-view peculiar to modern Western society, according to Weber, was rationalism or formal rationality. It was the development of this particular spirit which differentiated Western thought from all other forms. The development of philosophical and sociological Rationalism as a theoretical/methodological perspective is documented in Chapters One and Two of this essay. Weber was able to demonstrate the growth and movement of the rational image of existence into many areas of human experience, e.g. art, music, religion, architecture, printing, etc. The pervasiveness of this ethos is Weber's illustration of its thorough acceptance by individuals. Rationalist knowledge, of any area, is the ethical, legitimate standard for Western society.
The prescripts of the Rationalist Ethos can be summarized in Weber's term as follows: First, and foremost, "Exact calculation [is] the basis of everything else." The ability to calculate the movement and outcome of social conduct in a manner as similar as possible to mathematical calculation is the principal rational goal. This is the culmination of Descartes' position that mathematics is the only true and concise form of knowledge. According to Weber, the Rationalist world-view proposes rational calculus as the standard against which all other forms of human thought or conduct that cannot be subjected to exact calculation is excluded as a legitimate basis for social action.

Second, as a result of the demand for exact calculation, all legitimate knowledge is depersonalized or dehumanized. Since mathematics is based on an objective universal form of logic, the historical, subjective nature of individuals immediately dismisses them as a source for legitimating thought and action. The rational-scientific method of inquiry allows individuals to establish contact, and hence knowledge, of the true source of legitimation. This tenet is necessary in order to remove any ambiguities or confusion from the process of formal logic.

Third, as legitimate knowledge and action are divorced from any subjective origin, abstract sources of validity
are introduced. These abstract general principles are those which have been produced by applying rational calculation to an area of experience. These "abstract norms" or "highly abstract rules" are then able to affect certain consequences in certain situations. Obviously any discipline which can be subjected to the logic of mathematics will very likely serve as a basis for this formalism, and contribute to the rational ethos of social order.

Weber further reveals the prescriptive nature of this world-view by comparing the contrasting developments of similar aspects of formal logic in different societies. Weber assumed that only in the West did a rational spirit, as described above, develop and flourish. However, this does not imply that specific aspects of rational-scientific knowledge did not exist in non-Western societies. Weber states that various societies, such as Egypt, India, China and Babylonia had "knowledge and observation of great refinement" in many disciplines. Calculation was used in many Eastern societies, with the decimal system being developed in India. many Eastern cultures developed sophisticated natural and physical sciences. However, these societies did not produce a Rational Ethos, i.e., the whole fabric of these societies was not based on the exact formal calculation of its
various aspects. For example, Babylonian astronomy, while quite comprehensive, was not based on a mathematical foundation. The Indian decimal system never progressed into a science of bookkeeping or accounting. Furthermore, Indian geometry existed quite successfully without the use of rational proofs. Therefore, while certain elements of rational thought can be found in most societies, Weber concluded that only in modern Western society had Reason become the judge of all correct and incorrect thought and action.

The Rationalization of Western society could be evidenced, according to Weber, through the unique organizations and institutions of which it is comprised. Accordingly, in terms of the purposes of a discussion of the workplace, and in Weber's own opinion, the resultant rationalist forms of economic, political and legal organizations are of singular interest. Weber's explanation of the development and characteristics of contemporary capitalism, along with the legal-political foundation it required, illustrates his rendition of the source and sustenance of the contemporary authoritarian organization of the workplace. For Weber, the peculiar aspect of capitalism is not related to the ideas of acquisition of wealth or even personal gain. Throughout history examples of avarice, ruthless accumulation and
shrewd bargaining can be found in nearly all societies.\textsuperscript{38} Many societies (Western, Eastern, etc.) developed systems of taxation, wholesale/retail trade, loans, entrepreneurship, speculation and investments of various types. Weber, however, maintained adamantly that the capitalist system of modern society was based on a wholly different process.\textsuperscript{39}

The singular characteristics of contemporary capitalism i.e., its genuinely Rationalist aspects, are as follows: First, Weber defined "a capitalistic economic action as one which rests on the expectation of profit," and profit which is continually "renewed."\textsuperscript{40} Furthermore, the economic action is always determined by the "calculation in terms of capital."\textsuperscript{41}

Second, the "rational capitalistic organization of (formally) free labour" is another characteristic that contributes to the fact that rational capitalism "has appeared nowhere else," but in the West.\textsuperscript{42} According to Weber, exact calculation as a rule of the workplace "is only possible on the basis of free labour."\textsuperscript{43} If every aspect of the workplace is to function solely as a result of calculations based on knowledge of the market, then all personal bonds between capitalists and workers must be severed. The only legitimate relationship in the workplace is one based on exact calculation. The worker, then, must
be a "free" individual, not someone who is personally tied to the employer as were serfs and slaves. However, the same type of regulation under capitalism is impossible since in this form of economic organization "no personal bonds of any sort exist." At least, personal bonds cannot serve as the origin of legitimate action.

Third, legal separation of business from the household is necessary if the thoroughly rational organization of the workplace is to occur. Legal separation of business from the household allows for the physical and social organization of workers that is necessary for the depersonalization of relationships. Fourth, and finally, a rational bookkeeping and science of accounting are developed in order to most efficiently and exactly calculate the growth of capital.

These four characteristics are, for Weber, the primary distinguishing aspects of contemporary capitalism. This is the form of economic organization that embodies the Rational World-view. In addition to these most basic factors, Weber noted a few important social implications of this form of economic order. Since exact calculation guides all economic action the capitalists rely heavily on the knowledge of various "technical factors" relating to production and marketing. Therefore, "trained and specialized personnel" who have pursued modern sciences as
a course of study, serve as consultants to the organizers of the workplace. These "experts" are able to provide information that will allow economic calculations to be most exact, most mathematical in nature. In theoretical terms these trained personnel are those individuals who, through the use of rational-scientific method, have gained insight into the logic of Reason, and can then orient social conduct accordingly.

These are the tenets of Rationalism as a World-view as it can be evidenced in actual social organization. Weber was also detailed, however, in his discussion of the social structure that would result from the rationalization of the economy and the legal-political system. Weber identified bureaucracy as the actual organization and manipulation of material and human resources in order to most accurately calculate the outcome of social conduct. Bureaucracy is the optimal manner in which to rationally organize a social situation.

**Bureaucracy: The Epitome of the Authoritarian Organization**

A bureaucracy is fundamentally only a particular method of organizing human material resources as part of an effort to accomplish certain relevant goals or end. Bureaucratic forms of organization have existed throughout
history in various areas of society. Political, religious, civic, militaristic and economic ends have been achieved through this form of organization. However, Weber demonstrated that bureaucracy existed in its purest and most pervasive form in contemporary Western society. The Rationalist World-view of contemporary society provided the fundamental precepts necessary for the proliferation of bureaucratic forms of organization.

Weber explains the theoretical connection between bureaucracy and Rationalism as follows:

The decisive reason for the advance of bureaucratic organization has always been its purely technical superiority over any other form of organization. The fully developed bureaucratic mechanism compares with other organizations exactly as does the machine with non-mechanical modes of production.

In other words, the bureaucratic form of organization is best able to produce the exact calculation required by a Rationalist World-view, and therefore, bureaucracy is able to achieve exactly calculated (legitimate) results or ends. The bureaucracy can, therefore, produce the objectivity which Reason demands. Any decisions, products, or information which results from bureaucratic organization will most assuredly be as technical and impersonal as possible. Furthermore, while rational capitalism affects the majority of workplaces in modern society, Weber contended that bureaucracy influenced or penetrated many
more. Weber noted that government and political parties, along with private capitalist enterprises were increasingly bureaucratic in structure. In almost all places of work, then, bureaucracy is likely to be the form of organization. In Weber's opinion "It does not matter for the character of bureaucracy whether its authority is called 'public' or 'private.'"\(^{50}\)

In his writing Weber produced a formal description of the bureaucratic organization.\(^{51}\) However, the purposes of this essay are to illustrate how a bureaucratic structure achieves rationalist ends, which by their nature preclude the autonomy of human beings. Therefore, the following aspects of a bureaucracy, which dehumanize the workplace, will be noted:

First, social action between persons is regulated and controlled by formal, technical rules. Interaction is not oriented by the actors themselves, but by the bureaucracy. The rules of the bureaucratic workplace define which relationships and forms of interaction are valid. Furthermore, the bureaucracy defines which tasks are necessary for its functioning, and which means have been calculated as most efficient to attaining them. In other words, the machine is self-contained in terms of its goals
and the most calculated manner to achieving them. The individual worker becomes merely a part or conduit used to carry out organizational demands.

Second, Weber noted that capitalist enterprises were "unequalled models of strict bureaucratic organization" because these workplaces demanded "the objective discharge of business to calculable rules and 'without regard for persons.'" The written, formal rules, which govern all human, social action within a bureaucratic organization, are always based on technical concerns. The most technically correct and efficient means to achieve bureaucratic goals will be codified as part of the written rules. Human claims or concerns have no validity in a bureaucratic structure. As Weber noted:

Its [bureaucracy] specific nature, which is welcomed by capitalism, develops the more perfectly the bureaucracy is 'dehumanized,' the more completely it succeeds in eliminating from official business . . . all purely personal, irrational and emotional elements which escape calculation.

It is clear from this passage that the dualistic nature of the Rationalist ontologies force the assumption that all thought and action which are based on a purely personal or human ground are by nature arbitrary, unstable and furthering only the interests of the pure ego (individual). The bureaucratic organization actualizes this dualistic ontological position by prohibiting any actions, and hence
relationships, that are not calculable—in the mathematical sense. Therefore, technical or organizational demands will always ontologically take precedence over individual/human demands.

Third, since bureaucratic organizations are utilized to pursue technical, calculated ends, e.g. profit, civic or legal statutes, "experts" who are trained in the necessary specialized knowledge will be needed to make the organization function. The specialized knowledge will, of course, be of areas related to the technical aspects of the organization. This includes management techniques which enable the bureaucrat to organize the human elements of the organization in the most calculated, technically efficient manner possible.

These three Rationalist aspects of bureaucracy have profound implications for the human beings who might comprise a workplace organized in such a manner. The bureaucratic organization controls and regulates social action by formalizing all the relationships within the workplace. The relations between individual workers are calculated and formalized as are the connections between parts in a machine. This includes, of course, authority relations. In fact, Weber noted that bureaucracies were able to maintain their superior positions largely because of the inherent "abstract regularity of the execution of
The authority in the workplace is based ontologically in the organization itself, i.e. the objective, not in any human individual, i.e. the subjective. Therefore, individuals can move freely in and out of positions of authority without every affecting the organization itself. Power is not the product of human struggle or negotiation, it is embodied in the bureaucracy itself. Bureaucratic, rational power can operate unencumbered by the ambiguities and instabilities of human beings, i.e., it is "practically unshatterable." The individual workers then have no ground on which to negotiate or bargain their own claims or demands with those in authority. Power relations are rationalized, and, therefore to argue against their particular structure is like disagreeing with the organization of machine parts in the engine. The only legitimate argument against such an objective order is one claiming miscalculation of a technical matter. Bureaucratic authority structures then are "matter-of-fact" since they originated in an objective source, i.e. Reason.

Since bureaucracies operate "without regard for persons" then every technical aspect of governmental and economic organizations must take precedence over the human aspects. One consequence of bureaucratization is that production tasks are fragmented into as many minute tasks
as possible. Fragmentation of the production process is the result of the exact calculation of the optimal speed, precision and clarity with which a task can be completed. Workers are then subject to jobs which require minimal skills, and are highly repetitive and monotonous. Furthermore, the knowledge of production is removed from the individual, as it is embodied in bureaucratic structures and accessible only to the trained experts. Those with training in any science based on mathematics will be able to understand the demands of the organization, and conduct the administrative and production process accordingly. Therefore, knowledge of a given process or product is not in itself sufficient to understand how functioning should proceed in a bureaucratic organization. The ability to calculate the various consequences of the operation of the organization is the specialized skill that is required of bureaucratic experts.

These aspects of a bureaucracy, according to Weber, result in the highest levels of "precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of the files, continuity, discretion, strict subordination, reduction of friction and of the material and personal costs." An organization based on these characteristics would have sufficient means to attain its goals in the most efficient and technically correct manner possible. However, a Rationalist World-view
assumes that bureaucratic organization is able to achieve its ends in such a manner only because it operates in accordance with objective considerations. Individuals must be neutralized and function as "objectively" as possible to allow the bureaucratic machine to function smoothly.

Conclusion: The Subversion of Formalism

In one sense the image of the social world that is implied by a Rationalist World-view is the antithesis of the Weberian image of social reality. As noted in the second section of this chapter, Weber understood social order to emerge from human experience. Social reality is not, for Weber, self-sustaining, ahistorical or objective in nature. All social phenomena are historically legitimated. That is, all social phenomena have a human biography; they are cultural phenomena. Social organization, then, is only the artifact of a complex of "intended meaning." Social reality emerges from human action, and, accordingly must always be understood within the context of that source.

It was through the use of this theoretical perspective that Weber was able to understand the various human efforts that were necessary to create a Rationalist World-view. A World-view that inevitably required human self-denial and a surrendering of human creative power to an abstract source of reality. Therefore, for Weber, "Rationalism has only a
human biography, since it is not an imperious Idea, but merely the meanings and beliefs of particular individuals as they try to make sense of the world. The proliferation of the Rationalist World-view is not the increasing manifestation of Reason, but has been thoroughly dependent on "the ability and disposition of men to adopt certain types of practical rational conduct."  

However, the human, historical nature of Rationalism is denied by its most basic ontological/epistemological tenets. The Cartesian dualism which underpins most forms of Western thought is a major obstacle to individuals realizing the control they exert over social reality. Weber recognized that introducing non-dualistic images of the world was a prerequisite to subverting the self-denial of Cartesianism. Therefore, in many of Weber's writings, he introduces examples of "substantive rationality" as another justified explanation of the world. Substantive rationality is a method of legitimating social action on "the basis of concrete, ethical, or political considerations or of feelings . . . "  

In essence Weber is suggesting that various forms of human reasoning exist, and the validity of one form over another is an historical, contextual condition. The validity or legitimation of a particular aspect of social existence is based solely on situationally defined meanings.
Therefore, formal rationality should only be able to take precedence over other forms of reasoning on the basis of the human context from which it developed. The claim that Rationalism is ontologically superior to other forms of expression is a result of the thoroughly abstract and ahistorical view of the social world which individuals have adopted. Weber's introduction of substantive rationality as competing view of the social is an attempt to re-introduce the concrete human element as a bona fide source of viable thought and conduct. In a further explanation of substantive rationality Weber notes that:

The norms to which substantive rationality accords predominance include ethical imperatives, utilitarian and other expediential rules and political maxims, all of which diverge from the formalism ... which uses logical abstraction.

Therefore, Weberian analysis demands the recognition of all forms of human thought and action as potential bases for legitimate thought and conduct. However, Weber is not attempting to inject the "Objectivity" of rationalist social organization with a dose of humanity in an effort to buffer the rigidity of formalism. Weber is merely following the basic tenets of his theoretical position by claiming that all subject-meanings and subsequent actions are biographical in nature. This biographical nature implies that:
First, a world-view/social organization is a cultural phenomenon, i.e. a human creation emerging from a complex of meanings. Second, the legitimation of a world-view/social organization is historical or contextual in nature. This means that validity is limited and must be relevant and justifiable to the real individuals in any social, historical context. Third, a world-view/social organization cannot claim to be ontologically superior on the basis of an objective, extra-human origin. All social phenomena are human in origin and must compete for social superiority within this context.

Weber's attempt to subvert the ontological superiority of formal rationality via substantial rationality has often been criticized as leaving the impression that any human expression can become the source of legitimate (and ethical) social organization. This critique may be due largely to the fact that the Rationalist World-view is so dominant, that nonformal individual (subjective) claims may automatically be considered devoid of any social significance. However, Weber was not explicit in terms of how certain individual ethics, values, political concerns and interests could serve as a basis for social organization, i.e., he neglected to give much attention to explanations of how social actors actually make sense of their everyday world. Many of the examples Weber
employed to illustrate the results of substantive rationality were archaic and atavistic in terms of their relevance to contemporary society. Critics have also maintained that Weber is suggesting only a form of relativism in terms of justifiable forms of social thought and action. In Weber's defense, however, the three tenets noted above as implications of the biographical-cultural nature of subjective-meanings insure that a solipsistic, relativity will not result from dismantling the Rationalist World-view. Chapter Six of this work will include a detailed discussion of the Democratic World-view that must be developed if the responsive organization of all aspects of society, especially however the workplace, is to occur. This final chapter will also attempt to explain the various aspects of how individuals actually negotiate and inter-subjectively create social reality, i.e. how ontologically individuals are simultaneously subjective and objective, or social beings.
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CHAPTER IV

American Management Theories:
The Task of Organizing the Workplace

Introduction

In American management theory there are very distinct trends or schools of thought each of which was developed either as a guide to practicing the tenets of the Rationalist view of the organization, or, in fewer cases, as a rebuke of such an image of organization life. In this dissertation the Rationalist view of the organization has been traced from its origins as a formal philosophy to its progression as a social philosophy, a sociological theory, a World-view and, now, it will be exposed as the underlying orientation of a series of actual management techniques. The management theorists responsible for the development of these techniques apply the basic assumptions of rationalism to every aspect of workplace organization. In essence, these theories of management illustrate the implications of Rationalism for even the most mundane experiences of the individual in the workplace. In addition, these theories demonstrate how in American society the workplace has usually been experienced by workers as a thoroughly authoritarian entity.
The management theories discussed in this chapter will range chronologically from the early years of the nineteenth century to the present day. Obviously, this summary will not attempt to provide an exhaustive analysis of the history of management theories in the United States. On the contrary only those theories which have contributed significantly to maintaining the authoritarian-rationalist image and actuality of the workplace will be discussed. The thrust of these presentations will be to illustrate the impact Rationalist theories have had on actual workplaces of the past and present. The management theories presented here will include: 1) Scientific Management; 2) the Human Relations School; 3) Systems theories of management; 4) Neo-Human Relations models, and 5) Technological management.

**Early American Management Theories: Taylor and Fayol**

The management theory which has come to be known as "Scientific Management" is usually noted as the first management trend to develop in the United States. Additionally, Scientific Management had such a profound impact on management practices as a whole that its dominance prevailed, with only minor discussions, for almost 40 years. Frederick W. Taylor is commonly accepted as the primary figure responsible for developing at least the initial of literature on this style of management. In
the 1870's as a young machinist working in the Midvale Steel Company in Philadelphia, Taylor witnessed the same social confusion and upheaval that prompted the sociological theories of Smith, Comte and Durkheim. Taylor witnessed two trends of the late nineteenth century both of which were having an enormous impact on the workplaces of America. First, beginning in the 1870's industrial production power was burgeoning. The invention of the steam engine provided a power source for large scale machine tools which implied a similar increase in the level of production. Furthermore, as noted in Chapter Two, the rational-scientific method had produced many innovations in a variety of fields. Along with steam power, advances in chemistry and metallurgy allowed for the development of more sophisticated machine tools, and more intricate processes in terms of iron and steel production. In essence, the rational-scientific method had apparently unleashed a torrent of industrial, productive capacities.

Second, the same era was a period during which Taylor observed that "the whole country is suffering through inefficiency." The inefficiency on which Taylor comments was a result of the concentration of large masses of workers into workplaces, usually industrial factories. These workplaces were loosely organized, with much of the production process based on "tradition knowledge" and a
worker's "personal experience" of this process. In Taylor's view the full productive power of the new innovations in various areas related to industrial business could never be realized, unless the workplaces in which such production took place were organized "in accordance with the laws of science." The workers' diverse traditional methods of production along with their basic laziness produced a workplace which in Taylor's opinion lacked standardization, promoted personal, not objective goals, and relied too heavily on individual initiative. For Taylor the objective structures (machine tools, technical knowledge) of the workplace demanded that its functioning be equally as scientific in nature.

As Taylor eventually trained to become a mechanical engineer, he began to fully appreciate the organizing power of the scientific method. It became evident to Taylor that science had been used to organize the seemingly chaotic forces of nature, and, therefore, the same method could result in the systematic ordering of the chaotic human forces of the workplace. In addition, like other promoters of the rational-scientific method, Taylor assumed that any social organization which resulted from implementing the rational method was naturally ethical and morally justified. This assumption is traced back to Descartes' original ideas that all the rational-scientific
method achieves is allowing individuals to understand the objective laws which govern natural, physical and human existence. Therefore, Taylor assumed he would be producing a workplace organized on objective laws, and therefore this workplace would be ontologically equalitarian in the treatment of the workers who comprised it. It was Taylor's opinion that if the workplace was allowed to remain in its chaotic state, the productive power of the industrial organization could never achieve its fullest potential. The workers, then, had to be ordered or aligned with the structures of the workplace in order to carry out the objective mandates of the organization as a whole. Management of individuals would strive to become as "scientific" as had management of the technical aspects of the workplace.

Taylor's management theory is usually described as progressing from the "bottom up." He assumed the key area to producing a scientific management was that of job design. Therefore, Taylor focused his attention on the efficiency and organization of the line staff of the industrial workplace. Primarily, Taylor focused on the physical movement of workers, space utilization and assembly logic, and only peripherally did he address issues related to purchasing, accounting and forecasting or planning. Taylor assumed, very much in line with Weber's
assessments of the Rationalists' demand for exact calculation, that job fragmentation was necessary in order to more exactly measure a worker's movements and use of space. In addition, Taylor noted that once a job was fragmented into measurable tasks then: 1) a science for each task should be developed; 2) workers should be assessed, selected and trained according to their compatibility with the particular task; 3) management should supervise workers to ensure their cooperation with the "scientific principles" of their tasks, and 4) management and workers should be assigned tasks for which they are each "better fitted." Managerial personnel, since they have access to technical, scientific knowledge, are "better fitted" to control and supervise, while workers, with only their common sense, are best able to carry out simple, tightly structured tasks.

In certain writings Taylor refers to his theory as "functional management" and employs an almost organismic analogy by explaining that conscious knowledge of production is located in the structure of the workplace itself. Taylor, of course, is best known for comparing the workplace to a machine as did Adam Smith. However, what is important about Taylor's implied use of the organism analogy is the complete bifurcation of workplace-worker for which he may have been striving. This theoretical move
would place Taylor with a group of theorists often known as "systematizers" who, as forerunners of Systems theories of management, assumed that workers must be provided an objective structure in order to function properly. These theorists maintained that any thoughts of the workers which were not related to the function of the task at hand would interfere with their physical movements, and hence disrupt the smooth functioning of the task. Therefore, job tasks had to be as simple and structured as possible. As much extraneous thought as possible had to be eliminated from workers' tasks, and therefore, managers were logically those who would make decisions about the organization as a whole and would receive the knowledge of the entire production process. Hence a rigid hierarchy of authority was necessary to ensure the functioning of the entire structure. In essence, Taylor's system of management assumes that workers and managers must be ordered in line with the objective structures of the workplace. Workers must relent to the objective design of their jobs, and managers must oversee their compliance and discipline in so doing.

Henri Fayol, a French engineer, is usually considered the Frederick Taylor of Europe. Fayol's major work, General and Industrial Management, appeared in 1916, one year following Taylor's death. Fayol's theory of
management complements Taylor's as it builds from "the top
down." Fayol actually applied scientific principles to
develop a total theory of administration. It is from
Fayol's definition of management that the classic, and
still used, principles of management were derived. As
Fayol says "To manage is to forecast and plan, to organize,
to command, to coordinate and to control." Therefore, in
contrast to Taylor's problem-solving approach, Fayol sought
to establish a universal set of laws which could be used to
govern the administration of an organization. Fayol
believed, of course, that the rational-scientific method
was the key to understanding the natural laws to which
human beings are subject.

Fayol is also more straightforward than Taylor in his
use of both mechanistic and organismic analogies of the
workplace. Fayol refers to the workplace as both the "body
corporate" and the "administrative machine." The body
corporate for Fayol describes the relationship between the
structures and functioning of the workplace. Much like a
natural organism, the workplace must be highly, even
rigidly, structured if the functioning necessary to its
survival is to occur. In other words, the structure of the
workplace itself must contain all the required knowledge
and power if the production process (functioning) is to be
carried out. The worker, then, is merely another resource
necessary to this process. Here is a classic example of viewing the workplace as being guided or ordered by an extraneous force. The workers are permitted to bring only their physical strength and minimal cognitive expression to the work process. The process itself is promoted as being created, maintained and re-created by the structures of the workplace. Another example of Fayol's position, that extraneous rules should be employed to govern the workplace, is his formula for determining rates of pay. Workers pay should be determined by: 1) the general business conditions; 2) the supply of personnel; and 3) the economic position of the specific business at the time. These are the objective standards for determining pay rates. The formula contains no factors related to the actual workers, the magnitude of their production, or the specific social context of each worker. In a Rationalist ontology these factors are subjective, and have no legitimate claim to effect an objectively determined rate of pay.

An administrative machine analogy was employed by Fayol usually when describing the authority structures of a workplace. The "Scalar chain" was Fayol's description of the hierarchy of authority that should be present in any workplace. The chain is the method by which the centrally located power is transmitted through the workplace.
However, authority is not diffused through the scalar chain. Each component in the chain is merely a conduit for the only real source of power, i.e. the "head" of the workplace. Fayol described the process of transmitting power as worker initiative. Initiative which was allowed as long as it understood and respected the structure of authority. Again, like Taylor, Fayol insists that the individual must conform and relent to the objective structures of the workplace.

The Human Relations School of Management

From the foregoing discussion of the scientific management of Taylor and Fayol it should be obvious that criticisms of the rigidity of this approach would eventually lead to new developments in managerial theory. The thrust of these critiques, however, was not to arrive in the form of a rejection of the premise that job design, and workplace organization in general, must take precedence over the individual workers if the structural integrity of the workplace is to be maintained. Taylor and Fayol were charged mainly with not producing the results their theories had predicted, i.e. increased production in industrial areas. Many industrial workplaces were still faced with numerous problems in the area of worker (not technical) productivity. In the mid-1920's ideas were developing which suggested that knowledge of the mere
physiological (time and motion) aspects of a worker's job experience was insufficient for truly understanding how to elicit better production rates. Many writers in the field of management during this era expressed the idea that knowledge of human psychology, particularly interpersonal relations might provide more insight into the productivity problem that had mechanical engineering. The theoretical approach that eventually emerged from these discussions is known as the Human Relations School of Management. Generally, this approach is credited for dispensing with the rigid, mechanistic image of the workplace employed by Taylor and Fayol. The work of members of the Harvard School of Business Administration, Fritz J. Roethlisberger and Elton Mayo, and William Dickson of the Western Electric Company, has produced not only a school of management, but also the beginnings of the field of industrial sociology. However, while these researchers contributed certain unique ideas to the study of the workplace, it will be demonstrated that their basic theoretical orientation still subjected human autonomy to the demands of a superior, extraneous power. With the introduction of psychology and sociology as tools for analysis, they were attempting to produce a social science which could produce worker conformity to organizational demands.23
The original research study which produced the "findings" unique enough to warrant the development of an entirely new area of specialization in sociology, began in 1927 in Chicago at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company. In essence the managers of Hawthorne wanted a better understanding of the "intangible factors" of the production process. This understanding was to be defined by Roethlisberger and Dickson as management's efforts "to understand better the facts of human behavior." In essence, since the human factor or quotient was clearly another variable that management had to include in their calculations of efficiency and productivity, more complete knowledge of this area was required. The research efforts to produce this body of knowledge were conducted and analyzed for nearly 10 years, and ranged from quasi-experimental designs to various interviewing techniques.

The most popular discussions of the results of the Hawthorne studies focus on the issue that work performance could no longer be viewed solely as a result of physiological states, structural conditions, or monetary rewards. Roethlisberger, Dickson, Mayo and other colleagues concluded that an informal structure existed in the workplace which was as much a part of the work process as the formal structure (job design). The informal or
social structure of the workplace could then be viewed as a factor effecting productivity. Additionally, workers possessed social needs as well as physical needs which should be fulfilled, at least in part, at the workplace. Workers also viewed their job performances as a form of personal expression, and not simply a mechanical, physical operation.26

These conclusions may at face-value seem radically opposed to the Taylor and Fayol approaches, unless the basic theoretical assumptions of the Harvard researchers are examined. Roethlisberger and Mayo, along with colleagues such as George Homans and T.N. Whitehead, were introduced at Harvard University to the theories of Vilfredo Pareto.27 Pareto's theoretical influence on the Harvard group can be clearly delineated from the Human Relations approach.

First, Pareto viewed social reality as a machine, while individuals act or function as molecules in a systemic arrangement. Therefore, maintaining the equilibrium of the system is of primary importance. Pareto compared the structure of the social system to celestial mechanics, with each distinct component fulfilling a structurally determined role.28 The system was guided in its overall movements by a general plan, which also mapped the interrelations between the parts. Roethlisberger and
the other researchers approached the workplace as a "social system," and even though they accounted for behavior in the workplace via the informal organization, they still maintained that the stability of the formal structure (workplace) "is not greatly altered by the movement of individuals through it." Internal and external balance or equilibrium of the organization is also considered by the Harvard group to be the primary focus of their work.

Second, Pareto maintains a rationalist, dualistic view of knowledge by suggesting that all knowledge is either logical or non-logical. Lawrence J. Henderson, a biological chemist at Harvard University, was largely responsible for organizing the Pareto Group, and likewise had an influence on the Hawthorne researchers. Roethlisberger and Dickson cite Henderson's definition of a factual statement in describing how to determine the validity of a worker's complaint. Henderson's definition, of course, reflects Pareto's logical/non-logical categories, and Roethlisberger and Dickson developed a continuum of complaints based on logic and the objectively verifiable nature of the charge. For example, Class A complaints could be verified on the basis of "sensory experiences," "logical operations, such as counting" or technological standards. Therefore, workers who claimed their work area was too cold, could only do so
legitimately if they could refer to a standardized form of measurement, e.g. a thermometer reading of temperature. On the other hand, Class C complaints were described as "verbal expressions of sentiment and reasonings in accord with sentiment." Roethlisberger and Dickson also noted that Class C complaints were often based on experiences of "daydreaming, revery, fantasy, and preoccupation." Furthermore, management can only "use" worker complaints as a reliable source of information if the complaint could be verified by an "objective reference . . . independently of the individual who made the complaint." Alone, without the objectivity of standardized means of verification, the needs and sentiments of the individual worker cannot serve as a justification for action within the organization. However, if management is aware of the sentiments of the workers they can use this information in order to gain their cooperation in achieving organizational ends.

Third, when speaking of the machine, i.e. society, Pareto noted that groups of Elites were necessary to ensure that the mechanism operated at full capacity. These Elites were, through their superiority, able to understand the logic governing the functioning of the machine, and maintain it in the most productive condition. Elton Mayo suggests that the major problems of contemporary society have resulted from the failure to maintain, what Pareto
called, the circulation of elites. It was Mayo's contention that modern society was in a state of disorganization due to the lack of scientifically trained administrators of economic institutions. Mayo noted that the present Elite of modern societies was "lopsided" in that only the "scientists" (not the administrators) were trained "admirably." Mayo also employed Durkheim's concept of a collective morality to describe why social disorganization was so widespread. The increasing complexity of society had caused a breakdown of former moral codes, and this cohesiveness had to be restored by an Elite educated in the social sciences who understood the rules governing human association. Therefore, the administrator or manager really cannot rely on the informal, social codes which operate in the workplace to produce the "human equilibrium" necessary to maintain the "integrity of the social organism." Mayo summarizes his view of the disorganization of modern society as: "The situation is as if Pareto's circulation of the Elite had been fatally interrupted—the consequence, social disequilibrium." Roethlisberger employs an additional concept of Pareto, the fundamental residue of the social organism, to explain the need to allow for the workers' expression or manifestation of their sentiments.
fundamental residue of the social organism, to explain the need to allow for the workers' expression or manifestation of their sentiments.\textsuperscript{41} The residue functions to maintain the formal structure of the workplace by providing the organization with a safety valve for workers expressions. It was one of the recommendations of the Hawthorne study to introduce a factory counseling system as standard organizational practice. The purpose of this system is to "improve the individual's adjustment to the structure," and consequently maintain the equilibrium of the workplace.\textsuperscript{42}

The Human Relations School of Management, although seemingly couched in more flexible terminology than Scientific Management, was actually an attempt to introduce social sciences as the tools necessary to produce technical knowledge of human interpersonal relations. The Harvard Group's reliance on the sociological theory of Pareto demonstrates their basic social ontological realist view of social reality. Their theories and recommendations basically continue to promote the superiority of the interests of the organization over those of the individual workers. Some critics have charged the Human Relations model is merely a formula for management to more successfully manipulate the workers they supervise.\textsuperscript{43} The distinct difference between Taylor and Fayol and Roethlisberger, Dickson, Mayo, \textit{et al} is the latter group
introduction of classic sociological analysis to the study of the workplace, while the former relied more on engineering and physiology. 

The Systems Theory of Management

The decade immediately following the development of the Human Relations School of Management is generally referred to as the era of small group research. The unique sociological findings of the Hawthorne research inspired a plethora of investigations into group life. From the early 1940's through the mid-1950's a variety of researchers conducted experiments in an effort to scientifically establish the social laws, which, as suggested by the Hawthorne investigators, appeared to be governing any type of group interaction. Although not all of these research efforts focused specifically on the workplace, they were addressing the essential issue which the authors of the Human Relations model believed they had discovered as an unrecognized, important component of any formal organization. This issue is that an informal structure or interaction develops among members of a formal organization, and must be included in any calculation of achieving organizational ends. Management theorists, then, were well aware of the impact this research would have on their field. The small group researchers, united by this common theme, approached the study of group life from a
variety of perspectives. They included persons such as George Homans, who was also a member of the Pareto Group at Harvard, Conrad Arensberg and Eliot Chappel, and Kurt Lewin. However, while their perspectives may have varied, the ontological thrust of the small group researchers was basically congruent with the Human Relations approach, and, therefore, the Rationalism of this theory was maintained in tact.

The early to mid-1950's, however, was the period during which criticisms of the Human Relations School, and small group research in general, resulted in the development of a shift in sociological, and subsequently management, theory. The decade of research focused, according to critics, too excessively on worker psychology, and seemed to diminish the importance of job performance. Since a primary role of management had been to supervise, evaluate and discipline job performance, the position of management itself seemed to have been diminished. The micro-analysis demanded by the Human Relations researchers seemed to force management to shift its focus from the task of attaining organizational goals to fostering better morale and personal relations among employees. Additionally, the focus on psychological and social-psychological factors as indicators of job performance seemed to place the blame for poor productivity on
management for not fostering a psychologically healthy work environment. This quandary that faced managers and management theorists was resolved by the resurrection of the "system" as the primary focus of analysis. Although the Human Relations theorists had never questioned the ontological superiority of the social system (workplace) their micro-focus did not provide adequate answers to questions concerning social equilibrium, integration and change. The sociological and management theory which succeeded the Human Relations School is commonly called Systems Theory.

Systems Theory in the United States is primarily identified with the work of Talcott Parsons. Peter Drucker, however, is the management theorist who adapted the work of Parsons and others to produce a commensurate approach to management. It has been noted that Systems Theory provided an outline for Drucker to follow so that management could finally achieve its long sought after status as a genuine science. The tents of Systems Theory and Drucker's Management by Objectives (MBO) which revitalize the classic sociological realist approach can be summarized as follows:

First, a systems or cybernetic approach demands that social reality be conceptualized as a functioning whole or organism. Each whole consists of separate and distinct
parts whose distinctions are based on the unique function each performs to ensure the maintenance of the whole. This image of reality uses the classic social ontological realism of Durkheim to understand the social. Drucker, of course, in using this image to develop MBO was able to return the formal organization (the workplace) to its proper position. MBO suggest that measuring overall systemic performance, not individual performance, is the most significant manner in which to determine organizational efficiency. However, MBO is more sophisticated than Scientific Management and does not foster a crude reductionistic image of the whole-part relationship. MBO and Systems Theory advance the image that each structural part can maintain its own integrity by virtue of its unique function.

However, and second, since social organisms, like other living entities, grow and evolve over time their constituent parts must change as more expanded or entirely new actions or functions are required to sustain the existence of the whole. Therefore, Drucker, via Parsons, realized the fundamental driving force or justification for the whole cannot be located in any of its systemic parts. If this were the case, then, as the parts grew and evolved structurally so would the overall reality of the system,
and therefore, social reality would become unstable and transitory. As Durkheim informed the Systems theorists, reality was objective, a Social Fact, and therefore, the driving force of any system had to be located at a higher systemic level than the parts. Therefore, this apex or "ultimate reality" of the system is autonomous from the parts, and relatively unaffected by the growth and development they experience. In terms of MBO, Drucker suggested that the workplace had to be oriented at a level which transcended any individual worker, i.e. at the "level of enterprise." Therefore, organizational goals, if they are developed in an effort to reflect the good of the whole following Durkheim's concept of morality, will always transcend the personal, idiosyncratic level. MBO is a format which allows managers to develop general, systemic principles or policies which by nature will benefit all those who comprise any organization. Criteria for job evaluations and job design, then, are based on scientific (calculated) determinations of the general welfare and what is necessary for the maintenance of the whole, and, therefore will never be biased toward or against any individual workers. As Drucker notes an organization's policy "must subordinate individual ambitions and decisions to the needs of the corporation's welfare and survival."
Third, the relationship between higher order and lower order systemic levels is such that the higher order imprints directives and information on the lower order. The lower order parts cannot reject or critique the directives, but merely supply the energy necessary to fulfill the higher order demands. Therefore, ontologically the parts of a system are dirempt of any autonomy from the higher order level. The function of the component parts of any social system is to ensure the sustenance of the whole by following out higher order demands. MBO, as noted above, encourages managers to discover the systemic principles which will assure the successful, continued operation of their workplaces. Job design is then based on these principles and supplies employees with detailed information on how to fulfill their assigned tasks. Job or work performance is measured against these job designs and hence any employee's success or failure can be determined. This process is possible since the employee represents a lower order part, while the objectives which management develops are derived from the higher order level of enterprise.

Drucker considered MBO to be an impressive advance over all other management theories because in addition to restoring management its proper functions, it provided the new "Corporate Society" with the ordering mechanism
necessary to integrate its vast membership. In a line of thinking very similar to Durkheim's, Drucker noted that in the 1950's society was assuming a "Corporate" image due to its increasing size and differentiation. Obviously the former sources of social unity would no longer be effective, and therefore, Corporate Society required a new mechanism which would ensure the cohesion or integration of its increasingly differentiated parts. In Drucker's opinion MBO would supply the universal standardization which would become the common ground or solidarity of modern society. Corporate Society achieves a mass production unknown previously, therefore, integration at the workplace is of utmost importance. MBO supplies this integrative function as it outlines the process by which job design and job tasks are derived objectively. This is a most concrete form of social integration in that the organization is able literally to supply individuals with their workplace identities, and maps the interrelations between identities. This implication of MBO is exactly Weber's point that in rationalized workplaces, no personal bonds are legitimate. Social integration at the workplace is a dehumanized process which ensures the smooth, efficient functioning of the organization.

In conjunction with this process of integration, the goals of the organization were promoted by Drucker as the
common ground or solidarity that makes sense of the entire system (the workplace). Since these goals are derived in rational-scientific manner relative to the overall purposes of the organization, MBO was considered a true science of management. Drucker warned that if a workplace was not organized according to neutral, unbiased principles, it would appear as a dominating force and result in "totalitarianism." MBO ensured that the resultant organization of the workplace was oriented toward goals chosen not by an individual or group of individuals, but according to the logic of the enterprise itself. Drucker, like most of the Rationalist theorists, invokes the neutrality of scientific principles to justify the subordination of human beings to organizational demands. As Drucker notes MBO is merely providing managers with an "objective" yardstick for making organizational evaluations.

Management by Objectives via Systems Theory was obviously able to overcome the individualistic bent of the Human Relations School of Management, and return the workplace, as a social system, to its proper position. Drucker, Parsons and other Systems theorists employ a Durkheimian social ontological realism to create the image of the System, a Social Fact, as the ahistorical foundation of reality. Individuals are passive receptors who depend
on the system to provide all cultural and social meanings and identities. MBO as a strategy for organizing the workplace imagines the worker to be a unit of energy in need of an ordering framework which of course it supplies.

**Neo-Human Relations Management: The Humanized System**

The late 1950's through the 1960's was the decade during which the "third force" of management theorists initiated their attempts to produce a more humanistic approach to organizing the workplace.66 This "third force" consisted primarily of Frederick Herzberg, Douglas McGregor and Abraham Maslow. While each of these theorists produced lengthy works on management techniques their orientations warranted a fully developed psychological theory of human behavior as well. Their psychological theories represented an alternative to both Freudianism and Behaviorism, the two dominant perspectives at that time, and hence constituted the third force in psychology. The types of management theories outlined by Herzberg, McGregor and Maslow focused primarily on the needs and motivations of the individual, and therefore, a complex definition of psychological functioning was required. Herzberg, McGregor and Maslow are referred to also as Neo-Human Relations theorists because they once again attempted to shift the focus of management theory from the organizational level to that of the individual.67 It is often assumed that Herzberg,
McGregor and Maslow truly humanized the workplace since they each promoted the idea that due to the nature of basic human needs the demands of the workplace should succumb to the demands of its membership. It would appear, at face value, that these humanistic managers had finally subverted the Rationalist ontology which prevents individuals from being able to assume control of their workplaces. However, Herzberg, McGregor and Maslow each produced a management system that merely accords the individual a more flexible position within the still dominant organization. In later years, for example, these humanistic theories would be merged with the work of Drucker to produce a more effective form of MBO. Therefore, also in congruence with the original Human Relations School the final outcome of the efforts of the third force will be to produce elaborate and comprehensive theories of the psychological forces that operate in reference to individuals' experiences in the workplace. These theories are then to be used by managers and workers alike to produce a smooth-functioning workplace designed to efficiently meet organizational goals.

Herzberg, McGregor and Maslow each criticized most other forms of management since these theories incorrectly understood the basic nature of individuals, and therefore, the techniques based on such theories were destined to failure. These other management theories, what McGregor
called Theory X, were based on the ideas that the individual worker is lazy, passive and guided only by emotions and the most basic needs of existence. Herzberg, McGregor and Maslow, however, concluded that a more relevant image of the worker had to be adopted if an effective style of management was desired. Each theorist developed his own unique theory of management, but basically the same issues are developed in a similar manner.

Frederick Herzberg based his Motivator-hygiene theory on the assumption that individuals are continually striving to fulfill two categories of needs. The workplace, like any other organization, had to be viewed as a source for need fulfillment. Basic needs or hygiene factors require elements of the workplace which will assure a minimal level of job performance. Hygiene factors include wages, fringe benefits and adequate working conditions. Personal growth needs or motivators require facets of the workplace that foster individual self-actualization. Motivators include personal recognition for achievement, opportunities for creative expression, and opportunities for job advancement. Herzberg charged that the original Human Relations theorists focused solely on a worker's basic needs and ignored the need for personal growth. Efforts to motivate workers must take into account this broad base of
needs, and each worker should be presented with opportunities for self-actualization and basic maintenance. 73

Douglas McGregor developed the dichotomy of Theory X—Theory Y in an attempt to illustrate the differences between the traditional style of management and his effort to align management technique with individual needs. McGregor outlined Theory Y as consisting of the following assumptions: 1) work is a natural task very similar to rest and leisure; 2) self-direction and self-control is the state toward which workers are striving; 3) increased commitment and responsibility are also goals of workers; and 4) creativity can be found to some degree in every individual. 74 Organizations, according to McGregor, should not be structured according to scalar principles, but according to goals that are relevant to the workers. McGregor assumed workers would issue their best efforts if their goals were integrated with those of the organization. 75

Abraham Maslow through the development of Eupsychian Management also advanced the idea that self-actualization is the primary need for all individuals. 76 Maslow suggested that the workplace should be structured so that individuals would be able to satisfy their hierarchically-ordered needs. These needs include: 1) the basic
physiological needs; 2) needs for safety; 3) the need for love; 4) the need for self-worth or self-esteem; and 5) the need for self-actualization. Each individual, however, develops a personal rationale in order to justify the manner in which specific needs are fulfilled. Eupsychian Management posits that every workplace must have a high degree of "synergy." Synergy exists when all friction between management and workers' goals has been eradicated.

In general it appears that Herzberg, McGregor and Maslow have developed theories of management which promote the individual worker as an active, creative being who is consciously striving toward self-control, personal growth and self-actualization. Each of these theorists suggests that organizational/management goals should be integrated with individual worker's goals. The needs of the workers for self-actualization demand that they have a more participatory role in structuring their workplaces. However, when the schemes promoted by the third force, which would integrate workplace and worker, and supposedly allot a substantial degree of autonomy to workers, are closely examined the underlying authoritarianism is revealed.

The inability of Herzberg, McGregor and Maslow to overcome the authoritarian image of the workplace is directly related to their propensities to always justify
human action with an extraneous, objective source. This theoretical move would, of course, align them with all the Rationalist theories discussed thus far. This evidence of maintaining a dualistic explanation of human existence can be found in Herzberg's and Maslow's explanation of the origin of human needs. Herzberg suggests that both hygiene and motivator factors are an outgrowth of basic, biological needs which are universal and unchangeable. Consciousness itself, for Herzberg, is purely a function of certain cerebral structures. An individual's knowledge, then, is isomorphic to those experiences which have impinged on the central nervous system. Maslow, in a more ontologically idealistic manner, notes that a universal and inherent set of norms resides at the basic physiology level of the hierarchy needs, and subsequently all human potential is instinctual relative to these norms. Maslow even employs the acorn analogy, originated by Aristotle, to explain the fulfillment of an individual's potential. Simply stated, the acorn, if properly cultivated, contains all the potential to become a full-grown oak tree. Hence, the basic instincts of the human being, if pursued correctly, will eventually unfold to become a fully actualized individual. The analogy is very significant, in that, self-actualization is posited as a natural,
evolutionary process. Hence, the process of actualization, not the subject (the individual), is self-directed.

McGregor in a more blatant stance admits that Theory Y supplies management with a more effective form of organizational control. It is McGregor's position that to date management has simply been too rigid in its definition of available means for achieving organizational goals. This rigidity has been caused, in part, by the unscientific nature of most management theories and the lack of understanding of the imperatives of the natural laws of social life. McGregor, like his predecessors, notes that a social science is necessary in order to provide management with the same technological control over its domain (human beings) that the natural sciences have provided over nature.

The forms of worker participation Herzberg, McGregor and Maslow develop also reflect the dominant position with which they accord the organization over the workers. Herzberg suggested that while workers cannot plan the goals of the workplace, they should be able to choose between a variety of means which will attain these ends. Herzberg also suggested what is known as job enlargement or job enrichment strategies. That is, as opposed to fragmenting jobs into the simplest tasks, Herzberg assumed workers are capable of "larger," more complex tasks. However, job
design is still, for Herzberg, a result of the logic implied by organizational goals. The individual is only able to assume responsibility for carrying out more varied and complex tasks.  

McGregor, in his attempt to integrate the goals of workplace and worker, suggests also that through the delegation of authority management can give workers the latitude to choose the means or activities that will accomplish organizational goals. The goals of the individual will be met indirectly through the direct pursuit of organizational goals. McGregor believed that a crucial role of management was to demonstrate the unassailable parameters which constituted the workplace. Management should illustrate that its members are also confined to these boundaries, and therefore all human fulfillment must occur within this natural structure. McGregor viewed MBO to be an excellent example of Theory Y, and a form of worker self-control. MBO would allow workers to clearly understand the logical necessity of organizational goals, and could provide a system of self-evaluation of job performance. The criteria for evaluation, of course, are derived from the goals of the organization, but McGregor viewed the ability of workers to have full knowledge of these criteria to be a form of self-management. Developing the criteria is purely a
scientific, objective task, and therefore the workers have no need to participate in their creation.

Maslow also articulated an admiration for both Drucker's MBO, and McGregor's Theory Y. Maslow viewed the workplace to be a natural system within which individuals are able to fulfill their predisposed potentials. Maslow also reconciled conflict between individual and organizational goals simply by this theoretical explanation of a natural system. Self-actualization for Maslow occurs when individuals are able to find their correct positions within the workplace. Maslow suggested, for instance, that there are natural leaders and natural followers, therefore an individual who was predisposed to be a leader could never find fulfillment as a follower and vice versa. The workplace as a natural system is able to logically fulfill all individual needs by achieving its own goals.

The third force of management theorists is able to produce an image of the individual as a complex, processor of social reality without relinquishing that reality's sui generis status. Herzberg, McGregor and Maslow present their theories as new renditions of the individual who is now an active being no longer a simple, irrational cog of the workplace machinery. However, these theorists are reacting more against the crude reductionism of Taylor and
Fayol rather than the Rationalistic ontology in general. When Herzberg, McGregor and Maslow suggest that workers can self-actualize within the workplace they are suggesting that workers are able to understand, along with management, the logic and structure by which the organization operates. This sentiment seems striking like Descartes' notion that the Method would allow every rational person to understand the logic of existence, and wrest this knowledge out of their hands of the privileged few. However, also in a Cartesian mode human autonomy is defined by the third force, as understanding the natural parameters that bind all thought and action, i.e. the authority of the organization.

Technological Management: The Most Recent Form of Authoritarianism

Since the early 1970's management theory development in the United States has consisted largely of expanding and refining two past trends which have been discussed above. A systems approach, usually in the form of MBO, and the neo-Human Relations theories of Herzberg, McGregor and Maslow are the two perspectives which continue to profoundly influence the management of contemporary workplaces. However, this newest view of management has been called "technological" because of the increasing reliance on the use of computerized machines as a means to
produce order in the workplace. Technological management, like the other theories discussed thus far, adopts a Rationalist view of the organization, and therefore control of the human element in the workplace is of utmost importance. Computerization of the workplace results in a thorough formalization of all human action, even to the extent of completely eliminating individuals from certain roles. Therefore, the genuine innovative aspect of technological management is the purely technical stance it is able to promote. Systems Theory and neo-Human Relations provide the theoretical background for technological management, while computerization is the primary tool used to practice these tenets.

Contemporary approaches to management are continuing to employ the image of the organization as a system for most of the same reasons that systemic analysis was developed from the onset. That is, Systems Theory correctly focuses on the "entire organization and not segmented units of the organizational."\textsuperscript{91} Systems Theory allows managers to think in terms of the overall interests of the organization, since "the whole is greater than the sum of the parts."\textsuperscript{92} When a system view is employed managers' requirements for overall employee performance can be assumed to be based on "objective criteria" since they are developed with concern for the organization or
workplace as a whole. Furthermore, by concentrating on the whole system, no biases can be fostered toward any one particular individual or group, i.e. subsystem. Indeed, this thinking justifies Systems-managers' claims that MBO, for instance, is a scientific and objective form of management. As a systems theory, MBO demands that organizational level goals and objectives be pursued in lieu of all others.

As discussed above, Systems Theory is considered more sophisticated than any prior management perspective because it does not promote a crude reductionistic view of the organization. The organization as a system consists of numerous subsystems, and "systems and subsystems interact and are interdependent." The workplace is like a living organism which continues toward growth and development as a result of the proper functioning and interaction of its subsystems. However, systems and subsystems are not co-terminous or co-constituting. An ultimate reality or "meta-system" exists which defines the purpose or goals toward which the subsystems are oriented. As also discussed above, the apex or meta-systems imprints or sends information which contains the prescriptions for continued systemic performance to the lower order subsystems. In contemporary management theories this process of transmitting information from higher order to lower order
levels of the organization has become a primary area of interest. The systems perspective suggests that the transmission of information, or communication, between the system-apex and the subsystems, and between subsystems themselves, occurs in a purely technical fashion. As the Shannon-Weaver model of communication originally stated, communication, in a systems sense, consists of inputs, throughputs and outputs. In other words a sender relays information to a receiver. The concept that supposedly rescues this process from becoming a purely mechanical action is the feedback mechanism. The receivers are able to make known whether they were able to process the information via performance, or carrying out the message. This, of course, is feedback within the system.

Additionally, since the organizational goals exist as the ultimate reality of a workplace, management also resides at a lower order level. However, since one of the primary roles of management is to ensure that "policy level decisions are put into practice at the level of operations," then managers need certain kinds of information which should constitute a "management control system." The purpose of such a system is to induce individuals to operate "in a fashion congruent with organizational goals." Consequently, this issue of the flow of information from the system-apex to the managers
has inspired the development of the Management Information System (MIS) as a standardized format for managerial decision-making and employee/job performance evaluations. A MIS is an objective framework that supposedly guarantees the information flow necessary to maintain the organization. The information provided by a MIS will continue the knowledge needed to meet organizational goals. If the factors utilized to structure an MIS are examined it is obvious that the framework is oriented solely toward the interests of the organization. Some of these factors, according to contemporary management writers, include: 1) economic risks; 2) company structure; 3) available technology; and 4) company strategy. Many writers refer to the MIS as a form of the new "information technology" that supposedly streamlines and refines the process of communicating information from one level of the organization to another.

The major contribution of information technology can be improved by the introduction of mechanisms which are most efficient at processing and storing data. These mechanisms, of course, are data processing computers. Computers can store, process and output information at more expedient and efficient rates than can human beings, and therefore, it is only logical that these machines would be used for this organizational function. In essence the
computer, in management oriented discussions, is merely the machine that can perform certain tasks for humankind. As Peter Drucker has noted:

The computer is a logic machine. All it can do is add and subtract. This, however, it can do at very great speed. And since all operations of mathematics and logic are extensions of addition and subtraction, the computer can perform all mathematical and logical operations by just adding and subtracting very fast, very many times. And because it is inanimate, it does not get tired. It does not forget. It does not draw overtime. It can work 24 hours a day. Therefore, the computer's major function is exactly that which is demanded by a Rationalist image of the workplace, i.e. generating information based on mathematical logic. Therefore, as Weber might argue, the computer provides the required information for the exact calculations necessary for the continued operation of the workplace.

The continued influence of the neo-Human Relations approach to management is also evident in contemporary views. The issue of human relations usually arises in the context of disruptions which would impede achieving organizational goals and objectives. The disruptions might be manifested as: 1) middle-level managers feeling "uncomfortable" about dealing with sophisticated computer ware; 103 2) the "cognitive complexity" of a line staff member may be such that an over abundance of information would essentially immobilize this individual; 104 or 3) an
individual may be fulfilling a personal need for achievement through ruthless competition with co-workers. Each of these scenarios is merely an example of the situations when managers must utilize their sociological and psychological knowledge to subvert any friction which might develop between individual and organizational interests. It seems generally agreed that if managers are to sufficiently "induce (not coerce)" individuals to act in a particular manner, they must understand the various factors that determine work performance. The work of the authors mentioned above and the research of writers such as Likert, Fielder, Argyris, Katz and Kahn, and March and Simon have provided managers with detailed information about the influence of personality, motivational needs, decision-making processes, cognitive styles and leadership needs on job or work performance. At present managers are urged to utilize this information of personnel or behavioral variables to induce workers to comply with organizational needs and demands.

Conclusion

The management theories prevalent in the United States for the past 85 years have clearly derived their basic conceptual frameworks from what has been defined in this work as the Rationalist or Authoritarian ontology of social
organization. Each of the theories discussed above presents a basic social ontological realism as the image used to describe and explain the organization of the workplace. In other words, the American management theorists of the twentieth century, like the social philosophers of the previous era, appeal to a Regulating Principle or Reason in an effort to produce order in the workplace. For these contemporary writers, however, Reason is not personified, it appears in the form of objective criteria which constitute the ultimate legitimation for human thought and action. The goals of the organization or workplace, which include specific production rates, profit levels and expenditures, have become the Cartesian supreme judge of true and false. These goals are able to attain this status precisely because they serve the interests of the organization, i.e. the whole, the general, the ahistorical. All human thought and action within the workplace must be oriented toward attaining these objective goals or all order would collapse into a solipsistic chaos.

The task of the management theorists discussed here had been to organize or order a workplace in a manner that would facilitate the efforts to achieve organization goals. As a group within the workplace, managers are concerned with control and influence over the behaviors of others. It was hoped that each new form of management theory would
produce the special formula needed to control human action. In essence, this hope was thought to be realized through the use of the scientific-rational method of inquiry in the fields of psychology and sociology. In Weber's terms, managers and their counterpart social scientists are the trained experts who would guide the order of the workplace according to the objective goals.

The individual, worker and manager alike, in these scenarios is, of course, the mere particular that is subsumed in the general whole. Therefore, individual or group human action must always be in compliance with the objective demands of the organization. Likewise, individually or personally--oriented thought or action is dirempt of any value in the workplace.

Considering these conceptualizations of the nature of the organization, and the individual, the idea of a democratic workplace is an ontological impossibility. The participation of the individual at certain levels in the organization as suggested by Herzberg, McGregor and Maslow, is, of course, quite feasible since they are only recommending that the individual be granted a greater degree of lateral movement within workplace boundaries. Actually the neo-Human Relations efforts at participation have accomplished little more than elevating the staff line
workers to the level of management. The objectivity and authority of the organization is sustained in tact.

Democratization of the workplace, as the context within which all thought and action is legitimated on a purely human, historical basis, or Weber's substantive rationality, is theoretically nonexistent according to the management theories discussed above. The following chapter will initiate the discussion of what constitutes workplace democracy, what attempts have been made to theoretically develop this form of organization, and why many of these attempts have failed to truly empower individuals in opposition to the organization.
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CHAPTER V
Workplace Democracy: Participation in the Authoritarian Organization

Introduction

As first noted in the "Introduction" section of this dissertation, these final two chapters will present various examples of contemporary literature on workplace democracy. The preceding chapters consist of a discussion of a particular, nondemocratic, philosophical-theoretical view of social organization. This specific image is identified as Rationalism, and, as a form of social-ontological realism, it promotes as a legitimate claim the view of the workplace as a "thing" which is external, autonomous and constraining to human beings. The preceding chapters illustrate the nondemocratic or authoritarian effect of establishing an abstract, ahistorical workplace ordering agent. Human beings are then necessarily perceived as only ancillary to the functioning of the organization. At one extreme the individual is often viewed as disruptive and unstabiling, and consequently, de-humanization of the workplace is touted as a progressive and advantageous process. Progressive de-humanization is, of course,
Weber's major theme in his discussion of the Rationalization and bureaucratization of Western society. It has also been illustrated above that Rationalism has been the dominant theoretical perspective throughout the history of Western thought. Therefore, social organization, the workplace in particular, has developed basically in terms of authoritarian ideals. Although, according to these tenets, the number of individuals actually participating in decision-making may vary, the process always occurs in reference to the objective, universal standards supplied by the Regulating Principle. The human element maintains a subjective, and, hence inferior status as compared to the objective logic by which the organization operates. In Durkheim's terminology the workplace is a Social Fact. Discussions of the decision-making ability or autonomy of human beings can occur only within certain boundaries. These discussions are, of course halted when the limit which cannot be crossed is encountered. This limit is the objective status of the organization which ontologically cannot be questioned or disputed.

The purpose of this current chapter is not to present a summary and review of the history of literature on workplace democracy. This task has been accomplished with a quality beyond the scope of this work by various other
The concern of this chapter will be to provide an illustration of the philosophical-theoretical view of democracy in the workplace which fails to promote a genuinely liberating view of human existence. The previous four chapters provide a quite detailed description and analysis of Rationalism as a view of an authoritarian social existence. This analysis suggests the various conceptual changes which must occur if individuals are ever to be freed from the bonds of the realist organization. The literature cited in this chapter is an example of attempts to democratize only within the parameters of Rationalism.

Literature from a variety of different disciplines has been included in this presentation for two reasons. First, a variety of areas will be shown to have developed democratic workplace schemes which do not subvert social ontological realism as one attempt to illustrate the pervasiveness of this trend. Second, a variety of disciplines will be covered since actual workplace organization is influenced by many different academic and nonacademic areas. Three general categories have been developed from the literature in question. These are: 1) philosophical-theoretical discussions; 2) sociological-empirical research; and 3) management perspectives. Each body of literature will be examined for evidence of the
specific image of the individual and the organization being promoted. These images, of course, will be the key factor to understanding whether social ontological dualism/realism is maintained as a basic assumption of human-social existence. Consequently, and as illustrated above, if this dualism/realism is not subverted ontologically then individuals can never achieve total control over their workplaces. There will always exist an inner logic, an abstract concept or even an economic law which people must realize governs their actions and possible actions. Therefore, any discussion of workplace democracy which fails to recognize the need to subvert social ontological realism (and suggest, as Weber did, that the workplace is only actual or possible social actions of individuals) will eventually have to concede that democracy is realized only as individuals participating in something greater and larger than themselves. As long as a social ontological realist image of the workplace is maintained, democracy will never be understood as the process by which individuals create, control and direct the organization, namely because they are the organization.

Philosophical-Theoretical Views of Workplace Democracy

A variety of works discussing democracy in the workplace are presented below. Along with the term
"workplace democracy" labels such as participatory democracy, industrial democracy, economic democracy and worker participation are used to explain basically the same situation. This situation is that a more collective, democratic style of decision-making in the workplace is theoretically and practically possible and desirable. The traditional workplace relations between management and workers are evaluated in this literature as deleterious, unproductive and socially unjustifiable. This evaluation is based on many different factors and usually related to a more general philosophical-theoretical orientation of the authors, e.g. marxist, pluralist, liberal, etc. In general, however, the traditional authoritarian relations in the workplace are attributed with resulting in either low productivity and morale; general apathy, submissiveness and low creativity, or social injustice and inequality. The practical frameworks for some form of workplace democracy presented by this group of authors propose to ameliorate this oppressive situation. Furthermore, most of these writings tend to define only one specific set of relationships within the workplace as forestalling democracy. The relationships between workers and managers are defined as the source of the oppressiveness of the situation. Therefore, these solutions propose either to
severely curtail the authority of management or dispense entirely with management as a distinct group within the workplace.

There is no doubt that as a group management plays an integral role in maintaining the status quo of authority relations within the workplace. However, the crucial issue here is whether the limiting or eliminating of management would profoundly effect the view of the source of legitimate organizational behavior. In other words, the order of the workplace might continue to be viewed as emanating from a supra-human source even if a separate strata of individuals called managers did not exist. It is evident that Rationalism, in its many forms, has often implied that a superior group of individuals, by virtue of their intimate knowledge of the Regulating Principle, are more qualified to interpret and implement the demands of the ordering agent. However, various movements throughout the history of Rationalist thought have attempted to equalize human access and understanding of the source of legitimate thought and action. Descartes' development of the Method was partially in response to the scholastic claim of Divine Revelation as the only legitimate avenue of knowledge acquisition. The social scientists who succeeded Descartes were also interested in formulating an objective, standardized method for acquiring valid knowledge. In
theory, at least, such a method provides anyone with a means of accessing Reason. Even in contemporary management thought, reducing the personal and subjective decisions of management is considered an optimal goal. MBO has been proposed as a form of self-management, in that, anyone who can understand the logic of the enterprise and the functioning of the market can formulate appropriate performance goals and objectives. Therefore, management and its authority can be diminished or even abolished without seriously questioning the image of the organization as a stable, objective, persistent structure and individuals as transitory, subjective, historical and hence inferior beings.

The writers who are attempting, but failing, to produce a theory of a democratic organization either misunderstand the source of the authoritarianism of the workplace, since they overlook this dualist image of the organization and the individual; or accept dualism as an ontological necessity. Many authors, for example, maintain a basic systems theory approach to understanding the nature of an organization. Systems theory, as noted in Chapter Four, is generally considered progressive as compared to crude, mechanistic views of organizational life. Systems theory considers many factors, such as influences from and effects on the external environment, for which mechanistic
theories can simply not account. However, ontological dualism underpins systems theory and while it may provide a more sophisticated understanding of the workplace, it is no less authoritarian or realistic than previous or realistic than previous orientations. Examples of a systems approach to a democratized view of the workplace can be found in works by authors such as Bernstein and McEwan. Bernstein suggests that the workplace should be viewed as an entity which consists of an "internal balancing of contradictory traits." Employee participation in decision-making is possible only if certain elements, such as an accessible information mechanism, an appeals process and shared profit, exist, since these elements "feedback and reinforce the whole system." Bernstein continues with abstract explanations of order by defining one of the "contradictory traits" as the democracy seeking individuals' "basic tendency toward activism and the organization's need for stability." Finally, this author defines workplace democracy as existing when these contradictory traits are "harmonized within a persistent structure."

McEwan is even more straightforward in his use of systems theory and calls his scheme cybernetic self-organization. McEwan recognizes the theoretical stumbling block of the "ultimate reality" of any system's perspective. He attempts to reconcile the autonomy which
should supposedly accompany democratization and the dominance of the meta-system by suggesting that the apex does not coerce but merely provides "bias [to] the autonomous activity of the other subgroups." However, the lower order units cannot operate without the bias of the higher order since no other source of information exists within the system. Therefore, both of these writers propose that democracy in the workplace is possible as long as the organization's needs and biases are maintained.

Another group of writers suggests the use of what can broadly be called a "contingency theory" of workplace democracy. These theorists suggest that democracy is "conditional" on certain social factors. In a majority of examples these writers openly adopt a social ontological realist image of the workplace by citing Robert Michels theory of oligarchization as the primary roadblock to universal, democratic decision-making in organizations. Therefore, workplace democracy, according to this group, is somewhat of a theoretical aberration, and can only exist under extremely specified and time-limited conditions. From this perspective, Rothschild-Whitt has developed an "ideal type" of the conditions necessary for democracy to occur within the workplace. These conditions will prevent oligarchization, and allow democracy, but, also consequently the organization will be transitory, and
extremely limited in terms of economic growth and life-span. Rothschile-Whitt proposes that an economic surplus and increased complexity will facilitate the movement toward oligarchy and displace any democratic control. Democratic workplaces can exist only if they produce goods or services "oppositional" to tradition firms; ¹⁰ are supported by a volunteer workforce¹¹ and maintain a "transitory orientation."¹²

These conditions illustrate that writers from this orientation view democracy in the workplace as socially desirable but almost theoretically groundless. Their writings actually seem to only reinforce an authoritarian view of the workplace, like Michels law of oligarchy, since they can justify democracy only to the most marginal social conditions. Ontological dualism is strongly reiterated by theories which define democracy as occurring only on a transitory, personalistic, simplistic basis. It could be argued then on the basis of Rothschile-Whitt's explanation of the foundation necessary for democracy that the majority of large-scale workplaces, which produce mainstream goods and services, are theoretically incapable of operating in a nonauthoritarian, nonoligarchical manner.

A final group of writers hoping to generate a theory of workplace democracy can be classified as employing a traditional social and/or political philosophy in order to
justify and explain the practice of democratic principles. Most of these theorists, since they are using a typical Western philosophical position, employ a dualistic explanation of human conduct. The philosophies they adopt are accepted uncritically. The only theoretical problem identified by these writers is that democracy, which exists in Western political systems, should be a legitimate framework with which to organize the workplace.

Bruyn and Nicolaou-Smokovitis, for example, combine a variety of different approaches to understanding the relationship between the organization, the individual, and society to produce their eclectic theory of the "psychosocial contract" which will produce a more egalitarian workplace. For these authors the psychosocial contract will "bridge the gap between the individual, the organization and society."¹³ It is this theoretical gap which produces the traditional authoritarian order of the workplace. The psychosocial contract will ensure that each of these three systems' rights, privileges and obligations are protected and "reciprocal relations" exist between them.¹⁴ The contract, then, ensures that individuals have a basis which allows them to promote their rights in the workplace.

Benello relies on classical theories of the structure and dynamics of the group to explain how workplace
participation is possible. Benello cites the traditional pluralist philosophy of politics as the one which "most adequately comprehends the group structure of society." Although Benello describes the tension between individual and organization as dialectical, he expresses the need to "reconcile" such conflict and employs the notion of synergy, like Maslow, as the manner in which to accomplish this. Furthermore, certain psychoanalytic concepts are cited by Benello as useful tools for understanding the resolution of the individual's realization that "coming to terms with authority" and "the identification with larger wholes" is not a loss of autonomy but a transcendence of the "original narrow self" and, therefore, a positive, growth experience. Benello claims this process allows the individual to "exorcise his[her] subjective demons" and develop into genuine self-hood.

Dahl, Sankowski and Pateman, in separate works, employ classical theories of Alexis de Tocqueville and John Stuart Mill to explain the possibilities of workplace democracy. Dahl, influenced almost solely by de Tocqueville, argues that while workplace democracy will, like political democracy, produce social and economic equality, it exists in theoretical opposition to personal liberty and independence. Therefore, certain limits must be
installed in a democratic workplace which would prevent the
total dissolution of personal liberty and the most extreme
form of democracy, i.e. mob rule.

Sankowski criticizes most classical political
philosophies of democracy, because they "leave democracy
only in the political realm." This author feels the same
democratic principle of a collective choice of major
decisions and goals should apply to the workplace as well.
Traditional forms of voting and elections should be the
tools with which to implement democratic, decision-making
in the workplace.

In a very similar mode Pateman reviews the writings of
many classical philosophers in order to focus on the
question of the role of the workplace in determining
individuals participation in political affairs. In
general, Pateman argues that political apathy can be
directly related to the nondemocratic work environment
which most people experience. Therefore, workplace
democracy would socialize individuals to thinking and
behaving in a more democratic manner, and eventually
influence all segments of society. Obviously, all of the
authors promoting classical Western philosophies of
democracy are achieving very little in terms of
reconceptualizing the social ontological realism that is
the basis for these models. Their arguments are really of
a technical nature as they make efforts to portray workplace democracy as logistically feasible and socially acceptable.

Sociological Research

Sociological and all social science research into workplace democracy has taken a variety of forms over the years. In organizational literature the Hawthorne studies are often categorized as having initiated a whole decade of projects which analyzed a variety of issues directly related to democratization of the workplace. Chapter Four discusses some of this research and the effects it had on management theory. Furthermore, since the 1950's research has continued on areas such as leadership styles, group interaction and personal motivation. In general, these studies attempted to measure the influence of the above mentioned areas on job satisfaction, morale, absenteeism, quality of production and production rates. Researchers as notable and diverse as Kurt Lewin, William Foote Whyte, Philip Selznick, Alvin Gouldner and Rensis Likert have participated in formulating this body of literature. One of the reasons that research on "democratically"-related work issues has been conducted quite regularly for the past 50 years is the success of many of the projects. This section of the chapter will not attempt to provide an exhaustive review of participation research. This task has
been accomplished elsewhere; most notably by Blumberg in his work on democratization research. However, as Blumberg notes the research related to workplace democracy has generally shown that increased participation in the decision-making process of the workplace has a positive effect on production rates and quality, morale, commitment and so on. Although Blumberg notes, unfortunately, that many of the social scientists involved in the research are perhaps too much in the tradition of the Hawthorne experiments since "participation is praised but no one asks any basic questions." Blumberg continues this thought by writing that "instead, the present system of ownership and control is merely assumed to be universal." While this last point is critical for the purposes of collective ownership, the focus of this dissertation is on an even more critical issue, i.e. the image of the organization and the individual. Therefore, within the framework of this analysis participation researchers have neglected to ask basic questions, because the present image or world-view of the organization as an objective, real thing is assumed to be universal. Ontologically collective ownership is not directly related to a nonauthoritarian image of organizations. This is basically the same argument concerning the role of management in the workplace. As noted in preceding chapters, in a rationalized workplace
authority and power are viewed as existing objectively in
the structure itself and not ontologically as the
prerogative of owners or managers. If this view of power
is, as Weber believed, an integral part of the Western
world-view then a shift in ownership or managerial
functions would not necessarily produce a thoroughly
democratic situation in which an intersubjective basis for
legitimate thought and conduct exists.

In addition, to Blumberg, Warner and Greenberg offer
reviews of sociological research, and Derber covers 100
years of practices of workplace democracy in the United
States. None of these reviews contain instances of
authors raising the basic questions concerning the dualism
which underpins the organization-individual relationship.
The literature cited in these reviews and the works
reviewed in this chapter uncritically assume democracy to
exist in a workplace if workers are granted decision-making
power traditionally only assumed by management. Variations
on this definition, of course, can be cited. For some
authors workers must have equal decision-making rights;
others are content with workers assuming any role formerly
attributed to management. What is truly significant about
these works, however, is that the nature of the
organization remains unquestioned and uncriticized. Some
debate over how to most precisely measure the decision-
making abilities of various groups usually occurs, but these works are dierept of analyses, in the Weberian tradition, of the world-view within which this decision-making occurs. Unfortunate, then, this type of research leaves the authoritarian organization in tact, theoretically as well as in actual existence. Another consequence of uncritical research is that when basic/ontological questions and issues are ignored, generally only issues of a technical nature remain to be addressed.

These technical issues include topics such as the level of decision-making which usually means on which specific issues workers will be making decisions; the specific apparatus needed to carry out more democratic decision-making, and the effect of various types of ownership on the acceptance of democratic decision-making. In terms of research that has been conducted in the past 10-15 years technical issues are often addressed.

Berman, for example, in her analysis of worker-owned plywood firms offers a detailed description of the technical aspects that have allowed worker-management to be psychologically and economically successful. Hilgendorf and Irving provide a case study as an example of the structures and information which must be provided in order for workers to make management-level decisions. Interestingly, they identify information on organization
"constraints which exist" as one necessary criterion for creating proper decision-making mechanisms. Duckles, Duckles and Maccoby discuss a formal contract which has been formulated between management and workers in one Southern factory. The contract stipulates the rights, expectations and authority of each party, and is an excellent example of the Bruyn and Nicolaou-Smokovitis psychosocial contract. Johannesen cites the voluntary failure of an economically successful worker-owned asbestos mine in Vermont. The workers sold the mine for a profit and returned to conventional workplaces in most instances. Johannesen concludes that the workers were uneducated in the area of democratic principles, and therefore a profit motive was more powerful. Kohn, in the tradition of Blauner, specifies the types of supervision and routinization which will either facilitate or hinder democracy. Conte and Tannenbaum surveyed 148 firms which included some form of "employee participation" and produced a continuum of the type of ownership which allowed for more or less participation. Finally, Toscano also surveys a number of employee owned firms and concludes that ownership of capital is directly related to the degree of participation in a workplace.

In addition to addressing the above mentioned technical aspects of how workers can participate in
traditional managerial activity, a number of researchers continue to attempt to measure the effect of more egalitarian decision-making practices on a variety of issues. The biases of these researchers are revealed in their conclusions that workplace democracy is successful if the worker becomes more acclimated to organization demands. This perspective, of course, has been fostered in social science research for the past 50 years, and is another consequence of the uncritical view of the organization assumed by many researchers. The current research on democratization generally produces outcome measures on variables such as: 1) absenteeism/tardiness; 2) desires for increased participation; 3) morale/satisfaction; 4) commitment to organizational goals; 5) turnover rates; and 6) production rates.  

Obviously, these variables are used quite regularly in organizational research to measure the effects of a variety of structural changes. The analysis, however, of certain "problematic" effects of participation further reveals the assumed nature of the organization. For example, Rhodes and Steers conclude that increased participation lowers turnover rates, but raises absenteeism and tardiness.  

Russell, Hochner and Perry show in their study of San Francisco refuse collection workers that participation increased commitment to the job, but also increased degrees
of tension, worry and anxiety. Hilgendorf and Irving report that workers experiencing increased participation learned better decision-making skills and tended to be more critical of management. These authors and others, when presented with such results, still do not begin to ask more basic questions concerning the view of the organization itself. The above mentioned negative outcomes are explained as either evidence of the technical problems which exist in a democratic structure or evidence that successful participation is contingent on a variety of personality and situationally-specific variables.

It would be unjustified to conclude that all social science researchers neglect the issue of more basic questions concerning the very nature of the organization. However, most authors who do raise critical questions are concerned, like Blumberg, with the issue of ownership. A smaller group has also raised the issue of the so-called "spillover effect" of workplace democracy on the larger society. This spillover will eventually become circular in nature. That is, increased collective decision-making in the workplace will mean that individuals will begin to act more "democratically" in all other aspects of their lives. As other institutions become more egalitarian society will begin to produce individuals who are better oriented to a democratic process and, therefore, the
participation in the workplace will progress and the cycle will continue. Peterson, Leitko and Miles; Wells; Elden; and Greenberg focus largely on the political spill-over of workplace democracy.\(^3^9\) They contend that one of the most significant effects of workplace democracy is that individuals may begin to demand more political participation as well. Representative democracy will simply no longer be able to satisfy the participative needs of individuals who experience direct decision-making authority in their workplaces. In sum, democracy in the workplace is viewed by this group of writers as fostering not only collective ownership, but also a more, progressive social consciousness. As Blasi and Whyte remark: "If worker ownership is simply 'peoples capitalism' then it will simply be a structure that broadens ownership and does not realize other social goals."\(^4^0\) Blasi and Whyte and others in this "spill-over" group are attempting in a more progressive manner than Blumberg to raise fundamental questions concerning the democratization of the workplace. However, their issue of concern deals with the particular kinds of values and attitudes which would foster more democratic interaction between individuals. Persons who have more egalitarian values will supposedly expect and demonstrate more cooperative, harmonized and congenial patterns of conduct. While these authors may have
uncovered various values and attitudes which, if socially ubiquitous, would produce a higher quality of life, they still have not necessarily challenged the universal status of the organization. In other words, they may have formulated the scenarios that would greatly improve the quality of life within most social organizations, but they have not questioned the very context within which this interaction is taking place. In order to accomplish this task even more basic questions must be posed.

**Participative Management**

Chapter Four of this dissertation presents a review of various management theories, and illustrates that for the past 60 years the focus of these theories has been to maintain and pursue the goals of the organization, usually at the cost of workers' goals. It may seem redundant to include participative management as a separate section in this chapter also. However, the trend in management that has been labeled participative is analyzed here because of the claims by many of its proponents that it is a distinct phenomenon; qualitatively different from traditional American management theories. The mass media has certainly contributed a significant amount of time and space to this current management innovation, especially specific components such as quality circles and Employee Stock Ownership Plans (ESOPs). Therefore, it would be remiss not
to make some comment as to whether participative management is qualitatively distinct from previous versions of managerial theory in the United States.

Participative management, as it is currently practiced in many U. S. companies, is an eclectic model of supervision which draws on a wide variety of influences. Many works on participative management cite the ideas of Maslow, Herzberg and McGregor as the basis for understanding the human psyche as it operates within an organization. The truly innovative aspect of participative management can be attributed to the influence of non-Western, specifically Japanese, styles of managing the workplace.

There have been several attempts over the past twenty years in the U. S. to initiate innovative, more democratic forms of workplace organization, such as the Scanlon Plan, General Motors "team-based" plants and various Quality-of-Work-Life programs. However, the majority of these models, which are based almost solely on the works of Maslow, Herzberg, McGregor and other sociologists, were extremely idiosyncratic in structure. Individual companies and often individual plants developed highly personalized models, often as a form of an incentive program, which were aimed at accomplishing higher productivity and profits. Consequently the success of these programs was equally
idiosyncratic. Therefore, while isolated instances of economic success could be attributed to these models of management, the overall economic scene in the 1970's was in crisis condition. Profits were increasing at an ever slowing rate and productivity was seriously unstable. In response to this situation, in 1980 the Japanese Productivity Center created The Association to Rescue the United States (Simmons and Mares report, however, that the group's name was later changed to the less harsh Association to Encourage the United States.) Regardless of the title, the focus of the Association remained consistent, i.e. to aid U. S. managers in developing techniques which would cure worker malaise, raise productivity rates, and, therefore, replenish diminishing sources of available capital. Since 1980 American managers have increasingly adapted both Japanese and Western European styles of management in an effort to develop newer, more innovative styles of supervision. While these innovations do appear to produce significant changes in the specific supervisory strategies, a close examination reveals that the underlying basic principles of management remain in tact.

The claim that Japanese-inspired management techniques represent a critical break with past U. S. forms of managerial theory is articulated by writers such as Pascale
and Athos; Ouchi, and Miles and Ritchie. Each of these authors claims that unlike former schemes such as the Human Relations School, participative management really fosters worker self-control. Ouchi's "Theory Z" and the others' Human Resources models do not supposedly strive merely for cooperation of the workers. Human Resources Management "involves subordinates deeply in the decision-making process," and attempts to correctly manage the "important aspects of the human flow through the organization." These two ideas, in fact, are the cornerstone of participative management philosophies. First, a number of writers focus on enlarging and refining the decision-making process in the workplace as critically important if worker morale and satisfaction are to improve and productivity is to increase. Shared decision-making is assumed to produce two important results: 1) group cohesiveness and solidarity; and 2) increased initiative and responsibility. Second, if group cohesiveness, initiative and responsibility are increased then the human flow of the workplace will be managed more easily and efficiently. Overall, participative or Human Resource management is expected to improve the quality of decisions, productivity, morale, communication and reduce absences, tardiness and turnover rates.
The primary vehicle developed to enlarge and refine the decision-making process in the workplace is the quality circle. Although the form of quality circle currently utilized in the U.S. was adopted from Japanese models, the original idea of the quality control circle was developed by an American statistician, W. Edwards Deming. During a lecture tour throughout Japan in 1950, Deming presented his ideas on the use of statistics to differentiate between production problems endemic to the process as a whole; and those which could be attributed to the individual worker. Deming presented the quality control circle as a mechanism to discover exactly where to place the responsibility for poor production rates. Deming's concepts were extrapolated by both Japanese and American quality control experts. It was soon decided that the exact calculation of production problems should be most efficiently utilized if every in the organization believed they were equally responsible for the quality and rates of production. Therefore, everyone whose job design was related to production would meet to discuss the problems and suggest solutions which would result in the highest levels of output. Eventually, the quality control circle achieved its present form as a meeting or discussion group of 5-15 employees, who discuss and solve problems of actual production, and problems in areas which may affect production rates, e.g., working conditions.
In some cases the circle has authority to actually make final decisions; in others circle suggestions must be submitted to a higher level for review and approval.

In any case, the quality circle is viewed as an example of how with participative management authority and decision-making power are shared by employees at all levels of the organization. Workers no longer see themselves as elements to be exploited by management; they are now in a kind of partnership with their managers. The mutual goals of both parties in this partnership is to improve output and expand profit. Achieving these goals will benefit everyone in the workplace, and this is often demonstrated by a certain amount of profit-sharing via the quality circle. In other words, a portion of the profit which results from suggestions of an individual circle is, in some companies, returned to its members.

However, as Anthony, and Miles and Ritchie argue Human Resource management is based on a systems perspective of the organization. Hence, a rigid hierarchy of authority would reduce the functioning of the lower order units, i.e. it neglects the "untapped potential" of nonmanagement employees. Likewise, since a systemic workplace functions on the basis of information flow, any structure, e.g. quality circles, which would improve the process of communicating information would be viewed as positive.
Therefore, quality circles and Japanese-inspired management in general has been adopted in the context of a basic systems-view of the organization. Therefore, while the components of Human Resources management may blur lines of authority within the workplace the rationalist ontology is still very much in tact, as illustrated in the following items: First, as already mentioned, quality circles include discussion primarily of statistical information. The circle members' views of the problem are excluded almost entirely. There has been serious debate about whether quality circles could be used in service sector companies. The argument is that as long as statistical measurements of job/productive quality can be developed, quality circles can be successfully used in any area.

Second, certain aspects of Japanese social philosophy have been interpreted as promoting restraint of personal desires and fulfillment in order to enhance group identity and cohesiveness. For example, Pascale and Athos explain that the Japanese concept of self is not individualistic and the Japanese view themselves only "in the context of their roles" in various social institutions and organizations.

Hence, collective decision-making can be of the highest quality if social integration is supplied by a social institution or organization. Third, and finally, quality circles are not mechanisms through which individuals can
achieve or promote their personal goals, but they are mechanisms through which workers become more responsible for promoting and achieving the organization's goals.

Since the advent of participative management it has been evaluated as successful as long as its results perpetuate the organization. Ways, for example, praises the rationality of one quality circle in a major firm because it had agreed that to improve the cost-effectiveness of production by suggesting that the jobs of 30% of its members should be eliminated. Ways comments that this episode is an example of the "inner logic" of the system being correctly understood. In sum, participative management offers only new strategies for achieving the same principles which portray the organization as universal and objective in nature.

Conclusion

The focus of this chapter has been to provide an illustration of the various efforts to democratize the workplace which, in essence, offer only ideas on how workers may more fully participate in the traditional, authoritarian form of organization. Authors from a variety of disciplines attempt to base their theories of democratization on perspectives which have been presented within this work as examples of social ontological realism. These perspectives include sociological systems theory,
classical Western social-political philosophies and the management theories of Maslow, Herzberg, McGregor and Drucker. Although many writers on worker participation claim to make critical theoretical breaks with past perspectives, their ideas can be examined to readily reveal the ontological dualism on which they are based. Therefore, since no substantive theoretical shifts have occurred in either sociological or managerial approaches to participation, contemporary writers are merely using different labels to present the same conceptual framework.

Social theorists and researchers, as Blumberg notes, are too uncritical and have neglected to ask basic questions which would perhaps result in substantial paradigmatic shifts. Van Strien comments that in terms of schemes promoting the so-called quality of working life "the main motive of management is not to share power with personnel, but to create better channels of communication . . . and to get decisions effected more easily." In general, it seems participative management is, as Woodward suggests, a contemporary scheme for co-opting the new working class. A better educated class of workers will logically develop higher expectations than their forerunners. Hence, making management less authoritarian in appearance and more accountable presumably has reduced any conflict created by the new working class' raised expectations. Woodward,
similar to Blumberg, charges that workplace democracy, as promoted by such authors as noted above, merely shifts a larger percentage of personnel into the decision-making strata, "but it does not challenge the oligarchical assumption." Bothe Woodward and Blumberg assume it is the role of the social scientists to critique such assumptions and provide answers to the most basic questions concerning social existence. The preceding chapters have been an attempt to examine the most basic or ontological facets of organizational life which have prevented individuals from assuming absolute control over their workplaces. In general, as Weber concluded, it is a particular view or image of the workplace which allows it to achieve a status greater and higher than human beings. In this particular chapter it has been shown that unless this image is subverted democracy, or the human/individual autonomy to decide the course of social life, can only occur within certain predetermined limits. The following and final chapter will illustrate the view or image of the organization which will replace the authoritarian view and allow for genuine autonomy to exist.
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CHAPTER VI
Workplace Democracy: Participation in the Responsive Organization

Introduction

The previous chapters of this dissertation attempt to offer an explanation for a particular form of social organization. This form of organization has been labeled "authoritarian," namely because it has subverted individuals' abilities to promote and pursue their self-chosen, self-inspired goals, needs, and desires or wishes. A philosophical-theoretical tradition can be illustrated as having developed a certain image of the social order which views the organization itself as constituting the basis of legitimation. In other words, in terms of the issue of legitimate or acceptable thought and action, the organization is portrayed as having claim to the supreme criteria of right and wrong. In this sense the organization is imagined as an authoritarian body since it is endowed with the ability or authority to regulate social thought and action. Human beings are then viewed as having the ability only to understand and implement the dictates of the organization.
This final chapter will present an alternative view of or organizational and individual existence. The perspectives of Marx and Weber have been presented above in order to initiate this theoretical critique of Rationalism. The following essay will include the works of a variety of writers who expand upon Marx's and Weber's position. However, before a theoretical justification of a democratic model is attempted, a discussion of a few critical issues of workplace organization will be presented. These critical issues can be viewed as the manner in which a democratic ethos or world-view would be manifested in the workplace. As noted in the "Introduction" of this dissertation these issues are the factors which must be reconceptualized and restructured if workplace democracy is seriously and effectively implemented. The previous chapters contain references to most of these critical elements, but for the purposes of clarity and cohesiveness the following section will discuss the issues in terms of the implications of either a Rationalistic or Democratic perspective. These implications will, of course, include the problems or constraints typically experienced in the process of democratization. Therefore the contents of this chapter will include: 1) a presentation of the parameters and problems of a democratic workplace by way of a discussion of certain issues critical to organization in
general; 2) a discussion of the theoretical support offered by a variety of contemporary writers for the "responsive" or democratic form of social organization; and 3) a concluding statement with suggestions for further theoretical and empirical research.

In essence, the purpose of this chapter is to illustrate the impact of democratization on workplace processes, which were previously understood in the context of Rationalism. This impact will be explained in terms of certain ontological-epistemological shifts which will displace the Rationalist perspective. In general the importance of a democratic pattern of workplace organization has been justified on a variety of different levels, as noted above. Management-oriented writers have noted the increase in productivity and morale, and the decrease in absenteeism, tardiness and dissatisfaction which accompanies increased worker participation. Social scientists have produced a plethora of research which indicates that democratization in the workplace yields positive effects not only in terms of productivity, morale, etc., but also in terms of the commitment and quality of working life of those persons involved. Many theoreticians have argued that in most contemporary Western societies political democracy is an accepted and valued process, while workplace democracy is considered dubious or even
bankrupt as a viable model of workplace organization. Many writers from this group are critical of an organizational or institutional arrangement which violates the basic rights of individual self-determination, i.e., persons control over their own lives. Ultimately, however, as Warner points out the answer to the query of why organizational democracy should be considered is found in the theoretical orientation of those conducting the evaluation. The variety of literature on democratization lends support to those who may want to justify the development of workplace participation on material, ethical or social grounds. The next section of this chapter will offer illustrations of how increased worker control over the organization affects its most basic apparatus.

**Crucial Issues for Organizing the Workplace**

An integrated, responsive or democratic workplace is an organization in which human interaction is assumed to be the basis of legitimate thought and action. In other words, the individuals who comprise a workplace are the source or origin for organizational goals, structures and activities. This position displaces the Rationalist notion that only an abstract, extra-human, ordering agent is capable of producing social order. Rationalism, in its
many forms, assumes that a stable structure or system is the basis of social organization. Persons merely supply the energy or movement necessary to maintain the system. All action within such a workplace is legitimated on the basis of its relevance to organizational maintenance. A democratic model assumes the individuals who comprise an organization are the only authority against which legitimate behavior can be measured. The focus of this section is to compare these two views of social order in terms of the implications each fosters for certain issues related to the functioning of the workplace. Hopefully this comparison will highlight the differences of each position for a variety of workplace experiences. In addition, discussion will be offered as to the various constraints which have been shown to exist when democratization is attempted.

The crucial issues to be discussed in both Rationalist and Democratic terms are as follows: 1) organizational goals; 2) the role of management; 3) decision-making processes; 4) job design; and 5) productivity/efficiency. These particular issues are considered significant for two reasons. First, as can be garnered from the preceding chapter these issues have been traditionally addressed in management, sociological and psychological literature on the workplace. Second, the reason for their inclusion,
here and elsewhere, is related to the idea that these issues are the very processes which are most effected by a shift in the locus of organization control. The goals of the workplace, of course, provide the direction toward which resources and activities are oriented. The role of management, job design and the decision-making processes structure and shape the manner in which certain tasks can be carried out. Finally, productivity and efficiency are really examples of goals against which activities are judged effective or ineffective. In sum, these issues constitute the most fundamental aspects of the functioning of the workplace, and therefore must be addressed regardless of the image or view of the organization being presented.

1. Organizational goals, within the context of Rationalism, are formulated on the basis of an abstract logic which supposedly underpins the workplace. This logic is what Drucker referred to as decision-making at the level of enterprise. In other words, most of the individuals in the workplace cannot promote goals which are meaningful or relevant to their own lives. Organizational goals are usually oriented toward achieving ends which supposedly benefit everyone in general, but no one in particular. Therefore, workers may benefit in the long-range from the wages they receive, and, as consumers, from the products
and services the organization produces. However, workers are unable to promote issues which the organization should pursue, or make any substantive changes in the already-chosen goals.

Owners and their appointed administrators are the persons delegated to formulate goals in the authoritarian organization. However, the goals they develop are chosen at the level of enterprise, and therefore cannot be portrayed as their personal goals. These individuals who develop organization goals usually reside high in the hierarchical structure of the workplace. Minimal consultation is sought from those residing lower in the hierarchy. Understandably, if goals are developed in conjunction with knowledge of the logic by which the organization operates, only those with the expertise necessary to comprehend such knowledge can be involved in goal setting. In a Rationalist image of the workplace goals flow from "the top down" indicating a vertical structure with only a one-way flow of influence and information. Some variety as to the flexibility of the hierarchy can be found in such organizations, but in general they can be classified as authoritarian. A democratic model of organizational goal-setting must, in a sense, proceed by dismantling the vertical hierarchy of the Rationalist workplace. In some cases, such as Jerovsek
suggest the hierarchy is not eliminated, but "communications flow vertically, in both directions, and horizontally." Organizational goals relating to overall concerns, such as productivity, reinvestment, etc. are, of course, still very important. However, workers are able to contribute goals which are related primarily to various work processes, especially those with which they are most familiar and knowledgeable.

Other examples of democratization illustrate an effort to completely eliminate vertical or hierarchical structures in the workplace. In these workplaces all goals are collectively chosen, with no one individual or group able to dominate others. In this type of organization every person is equally the object and wielder of organizational power. In either scenario, when goal-setting is a collective task mechanisms must be developed which allow for information to be disseminated to all levels in the organization, and for discussion and actual goal development. In Yugoslavia for example small-sized workplaces include general meetings for the entire workforce. Companies who employ large numbers of workers operate by way of an elected group which forms a workers' council. Berman outlines a similar structure of collective organization in her description of worker-owned plywood companies in the United States. Many problems,
however, have been encountered with the introduction of horizontal structures. Certain aspects of these problems will be addressed at the end of this section.

2. The role of management in the workplace is perhaps one of the most discussed issues in this dissertation. It has been noted in the preceding chapters that within an authoritarian organization managers supervise compliance with organizational goals and policies. Traditionally this function has resulted in a concentration of power/authority, a comprehensive span of control, and emphasis on the specialization and expertise of managerial personnel. This power management wields is directed not only at workers, but often at the owners of organizations themselves. Gorz has noted that managers, or "specialists in coordination, planning and synthesis," have created a "technocracy" which only they can control. The preceding chapters of this work contain many discussions of the role of management, and so there is no need to expand on this issue here.

In a democratic workplace, the distinction between workers and managers is theoretically eliminated. However, it does not seem feasible to suggest that all managerial and administrative functions will be accomplished collectively, with every person participating literally in every decision. This does not imply that workers must
either relinquish all control or be faced with a logistically impossible decision-making situation. The Yugoslavian model of self-management, for example, includes a managerial role, however, the persons who become managers are: 1) elected by the general membership of the workplace; 2) under a limited tenure; 3) subjected to recall by the general membership; 4) subjected to the veto power of the general membership; and 5) to receive no special social or monetary rewards or recognition for their positions. In this situation management is always "accountable" to the general membership, and cannot claim their decisions are removed from public scrutiny. In essence, democratic workplaces may incorporate the role of manager without allowing this position to claim ontological precedence over any others.

3. Decision-making processes in a Rationalistic workplace are highly centralized and operate within the context of specialized, technical knowledge. In Weberian terms trained experts are often hired in order to ensure the technical superiority of decisions. Also in Weber's terms the more exactly calculated a decision is the more objective or superior it is assumed to be. The Rationalist tradition has also held claim to an ontological relationship between the objective and ethical or moral nature of a decision.
In a democratic workplace, as noted above, decision-making becomes more horizontal or at least decentralized. However, it may seem that even if decision-making includes all workers, and genuine efforts are made to disseminate the information necessary, the highly technical nature of the information will exclude many workers from participating informatively. Two responses have been forthcoming to this argument. First, writers such as Gorz and Braverman argue that technical knowledge is not simply specialized, but also mystified. In other words, experts in a variety of fields have purposely portrayed their knowledge as incomprehensible to those without technical training, and therefore deprived individuals "of the competence necessary for self-management and democracy." Therefore, while there, of course, exists certain kinds of information which all but a few lack the training to grasp adequately, all specialized knowledge must be analyzed in terms of which portions can be distributed throughout the workplace.

Second, and perhaps more importantly, specialized, technical knowledge must, in a democratic workplace, be tempered by the social context within which it is implemented. This is another manner in which to demystify technical knowledge. It must be assumed that the most technically accurate decisions are not automatically the
most socially responsible or moral decisions. In a
democratic workplace the social impact of a decision cannot
be dismissed as an irrelevant claim because the decision is
technically accurate. Therefore, in a democratic workplace
specialized knowledge may be highly valued and frequently
the basis of decisions, however, it must also be socially
and morally accountable. In Yugoslavia, for example,
technical decisions cannot be "anti-social."  

4. The issue of job design in an authoritarian
workplace is best illustrated in terms of the Rationalist
view of roles which exist in the organization. The
ontological realist view assumes that individuals merely
"pass through" social organizations and institutions. In
the workplace jobs or roles are designed in terms of which
functions are logically related to pursuing organizational
goals. Workers encounter their jobs as predefined roles
which exist in an already established organization.
Integrating workers into these job roles is usually one of
the coordinating functions of management. Management
theorists such as Drucker, Herzberg, Maslow and McGregor,
who proposed that jobs should satisfy workers' personal
needs as well as organizational goals, granted precedence
to the organization and suggested that personal needs could
be satisfied indirectly through direct pursuit of
organization goals.
A democratized view of job design would again take into account individuals' needs and preferences. Jobs would be designed to directly pursue both individual and organizational goals. Once again the issue of disseminating relevant knowledge about the functions necessary for attaining organizational goals is a concern here. However, democratizing job design does not call for the complete individuation of each job role. Workers can be trained in terms of what their jobs require if the organization is to achieve its primary goals, and then more individually relevant aspects can be incorporated.

5. In an authoritarian workplace measures of productivity and efficiency are perhaps most effected by the Rationalist demand for exact calculation of all phenomena. Productivity and efficiency are usually measured solely in mathematical terms. Although the "human quotient" is often highly variable, most other factors in calculations or productivity and efficiency are considered reliable measures of organizational activity. In this particular area formulae of cost/benefit or cost/profit analysis are considered all that is necessary to understand the productivity and efficiency of the workplace.

As with other issues related to the use of technical knowledge in a democratized workplace measures of productivity would not be limited to economic terms.
Social as well as economic accounting must be accomplished. Productivity must be measured in terms of meeting people's needs, and not simply fulfilling a mathematical expectation. Quantitative measures, in a democratic model, only comprise one facet of productivity. Likewise, measures of efficiency must account for the social cost or personal expenditures involved. The most technically efficient production process may demand a social cost the workers are unwilling to contribute, and therefore the process must be tempered accordingly.

The five issues presented above offer only brief illustrations of the implications of both Rationalist and Democratic frameworks of workplace organization. However, the preceding chapters present only a detailed account of the many limitations and problems associated with an authoritarian organization. Therefore, the final paragraphs of this section will address problems commonly encountered in the process of democratization. Examples of workplace democratization in Yugoslavia have already been noted. Accordingly, since the Yugoslav model of self-management has undergone considerable analysis and research many of the problems encountered there will be highlighted in this discussion.

Decentralization of authority in the workplace is one of the immediate implications of democratization. However,
whether a pure horizontal structure or a modified vertical structure is desired, this structure must be purged of the power imbalance between workers and managers/administrators. Yugoslav sociologists have addressed this issue as: decentralizing while ignoring the "power barriers" to participation and without challenging "the scientific organization of work." Therefore while structural decentralization occurred corresponding changes in the "work culture" were inadequate to support the new form of organization. Hence a kind of organizational breakdown has been evidenced as a result of decentralization. In the 1960's Yugoslav sociologists began to conduct research in the self-managed workplaces, and surprised many with their findings that full-scale democratization is not a panacea for all organizational ills. The problems the sociologists cited are related to the issues discussed above.

In Yugoslav self-managed workplaces there has often been a certain amount of disinterest on the part of workers in actual participation. A sociological survey of workers' interests concluded that self-management was often ranked after higher wages, nice co-workers and competent supervisors. Sirc reports that many workers considered meetings and discussion groups "a waste of time" for two reasons. First, the directors and managers were viewed
as only interested in general long-range goals, while workers felt goals related to working conditions and wages were not granted adequate attention. Second, workers described themselves as existing in a state of "powerful impotence." Technically power was equally distributed throughout the workplace. However, workers felt they had neither the time or the knowledge to exercise all their formal authority.

Interestingly, the Yugoslav sociologists have not analyzed this situation in terms of a need to simply educate workers. Education, of course, is beneficial to most individuals, but Rus could not find a relationship between the amount of workers' education and the degree of participation in self-management. The key, according to Rus, to participation in self-management is the degree to which "spontaneous and institutionalized" participation is merged. Therefore, there is no need to produce an "academized" workforce in order to have a democratic workplace. Yugoslav workers apparently are not interested in making every decision concerning the workplace, only in being able to check those who are responsible for making certain decisions. It should also be noted, however, that Yugoslav managers charge that workers do not think in terms of the organization. For example, workers often want
to commit nearly all revenue to wages, and severely drain any funds which could be used for reinvestments.\textsuperscript{22}

Consequently, these conflicts have often resulted in the formation of informal groups (representing workers and managers) who are able to influence decision-making.\textsuperscript{23} This results in still another kind of impotent power. Informal groups can often promote interests, but cannot be held accountable (positively or negatively) for these outcomes. Clearly, there is the need as Rus and Sirc note to legitimize spontaneous forms of participation, and provide a forum for all initiatives in the workplace. Likewise a kind of balance must be maintained which gives voice to both specialized and social information. Technical knowledge must be tempered by social interests, but its use should not be unduly hampered. Therefore, most of the problems attributed to democratization seem to stem from too much concentration on dismantling the authoritarian workplace, and only a paucity of effort toward construction alternative processes. For example, in terms of earlier discussions of productivity and efficiency, a major problem exists in terms of how social costs are measured. Ultimately, this is still a question of decision-making and authority. As has been argued throughout this dissertation, the promise of resolving some of these conflicts may lie in the development of a
genuinely democratic image of the workplace. This social imagery will not contain obvious answers to all the practical problems of democratization, but it will provide an illustration of the fundamental assumptions which must be made if it is even to be possible for these dilemmas to be overcome.

The Responsive Organization: Ontological-Epistemological Assumptions

In Chapters Two and Three of this dissertation the social theoretical positions of Karl Marx and Max Weber are presented as opening critiques of Rationalism. Marx and Weber, although assuming diverse positions, both advance the notion that the acting, historical human being is the primary source of legitimate social thought and action. Marx articulated this position by claiming the individual is a species-being, i.e., a conscious creator of the world. Weber attempted to understand all social phenomena as based on the intended subjective-meanings of interacting individuals. Furthermore, Marx and Weber well understood the disarming influence of Rationalist social theories. Marx elucidated this point with a discussion of the alienating effect of what he called ideologies or fetishisms. Weber produced, of course, his elaborate discussion of the rationalized World-view which was the basis of Western culture. In essence, both of these
theorists' arguments adopt a similar cast when they critique any ontological-epistemological position as creators of social reality. In order to more fully explore these critiques of Rationalism, four additional theoretical positions will be presented. These positions offer both a contemporary critique of Rationalism and a discussion of the ontological basis for a genuinely democratic view of social order. The image they create of social order can be called responsive since the organization is no longer viewed as an authority over and against individuals. The organization, since it is the coordination of human interaction, is not a thing but a response to individuals' actions, i.e., individuals responding to other individuals' conduct. The four theoretical positions to be presented include: 1) Blumerian Symbolic Interactionism; 2) Phenomenological Sociology; 3) Critical Theory; and 4) Yugoslavian Marxism.

Symbolic-interactionism is a label which subtends a wide-range of theoretical stances. For the purposes of this discussion the interpretation of symbolic-interactionism as fostered by Herbert Blumer will be presented. Blumer often initiated presentations of his theoretical position by formulating a critique of what he called "the shortcomings" of sociological theories. These shortcomings can be briefly stated as follows: 1)
traditional theory is abstract and divorced from the empirical world;\textsuperscript{25} 2) traditional methodology sterilizes social reality and presents it as a "fixed form";\textsuperscript{26} and 3) social reality is generally misunderstood as social theorists allow themselves to become trapped in a myriad of a priori images.\textsuperscript{27} In essence, these tenets offer a critique of the Rationalist position.

It may appear confusing that Blumer considers divorcement from the empirical world a criticism of traditional social theories. Alfred Schutz and other phenomenologists echo a similar complaint. The use of the term empirical by Blumer, however, is his effort to shun the use of the abstract scheme which must accompany empiricism according to Rationalist ontology-epistemology.\textsuperscript{28} It should be noted that empirical knowledge is permissible, according to Rationalism, as long as it is purged of any subjective element. Blumer, in contrast, understands abstract notions of social order to be coercing empirical results, because social reality is not understood in terms of the meanings of those individuals comprising it. Rationalism understands these meanings to be subjective and, therefore, irrelevant.

For Blumer the only basis of social legitimation is experience or social action.\textsuperscript{29} In other words, if social order is to be understood as subject to human control, then
organization must be viewed as emerging from a human context. For Blumer, social phenomena must be conceptualized in terms of actual, ongoing human interaction. Furthermore, interaction is promoted as occurring when individuals understand their own meanings, and the meanings of others, and act on the basis of these. In a tone reminiscent of Weber, Blumer writes that "the most important feature of human association is that the participants take each other into account." Therefore, social action cannot be understood as being legitimized on a sui generis standard. All forms of human action (personal, group, representative) are constructed by individuals acting in situations which must be interpreted. Therefore, as individuals make judgments as to the appropriateness of a given action "they are necessarily required to take account of the actions of one another as they form their own actions." Each actor is equally reflexive when formulating his/her own actions. Each has an awareness of the interpretive ability of the other and the "common definitions" of appropriate behavior which have developed through what Blumer calls "transaction." Transaction refers to the ability of actors, through "discussion, counseling and debate," to merge or fit their conduct together in order to produce continuous interaction. For Blumer social organization
is not the product of natural drives, instincts or forces which compel individuals to act in a certain manner. Instead organization is viewed as the process of individuals constructing and directing their own activities, which they do by interpreting the situation and deciding to act on the basis of those interpretations.

Blumer, like most other social theorists, argued that epistemological-methodological assumptions must be congruent with the nature of the specific subject-matter under investigation. Therefore, since Blumer views social order as the result of individuals interacting on the basis of the meanings to which they subscribe, he proposes a "sensitizing" methodology which would allow a researcher to grasp the situationally-specific, common definitions operating in any setting. Blumer rejects any immediate equation of sociological methodology with "quantitative procedures;" "sophisticated statistical and mathematical techniques;" and "logical and mathematical models." For Blumer, the sociologist, if he/she is to develop genuine knowledge of a social setting, must reach an understanding of the meanings on which people base their actions. The world must be understood from the viewpoint of those who comprise it. Furthermore, the researcher should be aware of the creative feature of research and be diligent that the assumptions of the design are not
mistaken for, or overpower the assumptions (meanings) of those under study. Consequently, all research-generated knowledge has limited applicability since all meanings are created within a specific human context. Limited validity, however, does not imply that each research venture is solipsistic in nature. As noted above, individuals can develop common definitions of appropriate conduct, and act routinely on these meanings. In essence, Weber's discussion of the Western World-view was his explanation of the common definitions acted upon by individuals in Western societies. Weber's explanation was limited in the sense that he proposed this World-view as belonging to a culturally-historically specific context, and not as having a universal, ahistorical status.

Phenomenological sociology, primarily as articulated by Alfred Schutz, offers a critique of Rationalism somewhat similar to that proposed by Blumer. Schutz, being influenced by both Edmund Husserl and Max Weber, offered a critique of both traditional idealism and empiricism. In accordance with Husserlian analysis, Schutz argued that these traditional (rationalist) ontologies' claim of the existence of an Objective reality is a complete misunderstanding of social existence. This claim or the "natural attitude" and its accompanying methodology or "scientism" imply that all data and experience must be
reduced to and explained by certain a priori analytical categories. In Schutz's view social reality does not exist separately in subjective and objective forms, and therefore, scientism is an inappropriate form of investigation. Three major consequences of this position can be noted: first, all phenomena are fundamentally interrelated and therefore dualistic categories are irrelevant; second, all phenomena are medicated by consciousness/experience; third, all phenomena must be viewed as possessing a common historical contextual constitution.

For Schutz no distinct reality can be attributed to any social phenomena, i.e., empirical phenomena cannot be viewed as autonomous from human consciousness. This does not imply that reality exists only in a traditional idealistic view of subjective consciousness. It does imply that all social reality is dependent on the intentionality of a human creator and/or perceiver. Objects cannot ontologically obtain any meaning which is independent of human experience. For Schutz every object is an "intended object" and reality is a socially intended product of intersubjectivity. Intersubjectivity can be described as a "reciprocity of motives" and a "synchronization." Schutz uses the term motives in the same manner as Weber, and therefore, intersubjectivity can
be thought of as a reciprocity or synchronization of the various complexes of meanings intended by social actors. In other words, social reality is constituted by human experience, while experience occurs as individuals act on the basis of their own meanings and the meanings on which they understand others to be acting. For Schutz this reality is the "life-world" which is the experiential basis for all legitimate thought and action.  

However, Schutz and others within this school point out that social actors do not experience or conceptualize their existence solely in terms of direct, face-to-face encounters. Since an actor must grasp or understand another's "lived experience" in order to correctly interpret his/her intended meanings, how can phenomenological sociology account for larger-scale interaction? Schutz notes that individuals can have knowledge of an anonymous Other's conscious intentionality, or anonymous meaning. That is, an individual will act on the basis of what he/she understands to be commonly held beliefs or meanings. Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann have shown that these meanings can be considered to be institutionalized or what they call "habituation." Habituation occurs in three stages: first, through an intended act an individual externalizes a meaning; second, objectification occurs as actions are reciprocally...
negotiated into commonly subscribed to beliefs; third, these intended meanings are internalized as they are incorporated into a process of socialization. Therefore, through these stages intended meanings come to be viewed as habit and not necessarily the intention of any particular individual. This does not mean, however, that habituations are ontologically distinct from any other intended meaning.

Phenomenologists argue also that modern science "ignores and dismisses its own foundation," i.e., the life-world. Schutz often refers to the life-world as "pre-scientific." This is an important point to grasp if Rationalism is to be replaced. Schutz wants to suggest that the particular ontological-epistemological assumptions which underpin modern scientific theories and methods are a result of human intentionality, and therefore they are another social product of human experience or the life-world. The scientific method is, therefore, no more or less objective than any other form of experience. The life-world subtends all social reality, and therefore, is prescientific. The major criticism projected by Schutz toward science is that it attempts to misrepresent its "intentional structure" and tries to obscure or disregard the very experiential reality on which it is dependent. For Schutz sociological methods based on scientific principles can offer only a view of the scientific world
not the social (life) world. The use of "abstractions, generalizations, and formalizations" forces the sociologist to disregard the social rules or "typifications" which operate in any situation, and focus only on preestablished frameworks of analyses. In general, Schutz was heavily influenced by Weber's methodological practices. Schutz suggested *Verstehen* allows the sociologist to understand the meanings and images used by individuals themselves to interpret their own and others' thoughts and actions. Likewise, Schutz also employed Weber's notion of "causally adequate" sociological explanations of phenomena. An explanation is causally adequate if it grasps the intended meanings of the individuals under study.

Critical Theory, also known as the Frankfurt School, encompasses the work of a variety of writers. Most notably these authors include: Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, Theodor Adorno, Jurgen Habermas, Walter Benjamin and Erich Fromm. In general, Critical Theory is a concentrated effort to produce a social ontology-epistemology which constitutes an alternative or opposition to traditional theory. The critical theorists view a theory as traditional if it is based on mathematical-deductive logic. This criterion would, of course, include all those theories which have been described here as Rationalism. In a tone similar to Blumer and Schutz
critical theorists claim that any theory which is grounded on mathematical-deductive principles will be primarily concerned with: data collection; the formation of primary axioms or categories; the development of a logical calculus of behavioral probability; and the development of neutral, objective methods of research. Critical Theory, in contrast, "has for its object men as producers of their own historical way of life," and therefore, is grounded on experiential not formal logic.  

One of the most significant implications of this alternative principle of Critical Theory is that "theorizing" is no longer viewed as an ahistorical, pure activity. On the contrary, critical theorists have offered a general critique of domination as a fundamental aspect of their work. This critique includes as its target any theoretical or practical scheme which attempts to distort the situation of humans as producers of their own historical way of life. Therefore, theories relying on social ontological realism/nominalism are obviously included in this critique. The problem presented by realist/nominalist theories, which results in social domination, is that the real nature of reality is substituted with an abstract, ideological view of Society. As Marx would say, realism and nominalism result in the universalization of a specific, historical way of life. On
this point both Marcuse and Habermas agree with Husserl's ideas of the life-world and intersubjectivity as the bases of all social reality. In Marcuse's works he notes that all features of social reality are created by human action (labor) and they can never possess a priori meanings.

The critical theorists, following Marx's lead, reject the notion that both individuals and societies exist. For the critical theorists the dialectical interpenetration of both elements results in the "totality" that is human/social existence. Adorno, for instance, explained this interpenetration in terms of the Marxian categories of use-value and exchange-value. Adorno views social reality, which is constituted by human intersubjective relations, as obtaining meaning via the individuals who comprise this reality (use value), and not from an abstract set of criteria (exchange value). Habermas expanded on this process suggested by Adorno to explain the manner in which trans-individual phenomena occur. Habermas presents social organization as resulting from "generalizable interests" which attain their status because they "can be communicatively shared." As already noted Habermas was influenced by the phenomenological idea of the life-world, and he suggests that the "structures" of the life-world "are determined by linguistically produced intersubjectivity and are based on criticizable validity.
claims." For Habermas "communicative competence" is the negotiated framework in which social interaction takes place. In other words, intersubjectivity, which is constituted of attempts to synchronize reciprocal expectations, is, for Habermas, a linguistic process. Social reality consists of networks of these communicative actions. Simply put, social reality consists of actors communicating and negotiating the frameworks within which future communicative acts will occur.

The critical theorists also reiterate the phenomenological critique of the epistemology-methodology of traditional theories. These criticisms focus on what the critical theorists consider to be the central tenets of contemporary positivism. Traditionally, the focus of positivism is to discover facts which have a "universal validity." When the positivist attempts to understand a particular social phenomenon, he/she does not attempt to comprehend it within the framework used by the individuals who experience it, instead an abstract framework is forced on the phenomenon. The so-called objective facts which result from this type of investigation are, as Habermas noted in his debate with Karl Popper, "a fetish which merely grants to the mediated the illusion of immediacy." In other words, Habermas, again illustrating an influence of Husserl, is saying that all that exists is mediated by a
human act of conceptualization or consciousness. This consciousness is by nature intersubjective.

The critical theorists, however, were not content to merely offer a full-scale critique of positivism without developing an alternative epistemology-methodology. In congruence with their allegiance with Marxism the critical theorists developed an epistemology which they called dialectical and hermeneutical. The critical methodology is dialectical in that it allows for the "interpretation of living reality." Methodological tools are developed in order to adequately grasp the "subjectively created context" under investigation. The research act itself and the resulting knowledge are not abstract or objective, but always viewed as based on specific, historical interests. The critical methodology is hermeneutical in that an attempt is made by the researcher to grasp the meaning, the "subjectively intended meaning," of the individuals under study. These subjective meanings are then examined in terms of "prevailing" and historical traditions.

Many similar issues and ideas are expressed in a body of work which has come to be known as Yugoslavian Marxism or Praxis Marxism. The Praxis Group consists of a variety of Yugoslavian social theorists who feel they have resurrected the most original form of Marxist thought,
i.e., humanist-naturalism. The Praxis Group rejects Rationalist ontologies-epistemologies which are based on an "abstract, ahistorical and dualistic" view of social reality. These writers assume, like Marx, that by nature human beings are creators and transformers of the world, and therefore, their creative activity is the basis of legitimation. Petrovic claims that the human individual is "... a practical, hence free, universal, creative and self-creative, social being," who is the central, primary force behind all social, historical life. The Yugoslavs also make frequent use of Marx's notion of praxis. This one term is used to indicate the view of human as creative, social beings, i.e., praxis is "a universal-creative self-creative activity... by which man transforms and creates his world and himself." According to these Marxists all social analysis must proceed from these assumptions and must promote "human self-realization."

The Praxis Group is, like the critical theorists, extremely dissatisfied with the positivistic epistemologies which are prevalent in the social sciences. In general the Yugoslavs reject the epistemological notion that an objective reality exists independently of a knower. Consequently, positive methodological procedures are rejected for the following reasons: 1) formal, abstract logic is utilized; 2) value judgments, feelings, desires,
etc. are assessed as unreliable forms of knowledge; 3) data resulting from positive methods are assumed to have universal applicability, or to be truth-giving; and 4) methodological rigor, rather than sensitivity to the meaning of the situation, is considered the hallmark of valid research.79

Markovic refers to positivism as ideological in that he feels it produces a social explanation in terms of its own assumptions, and not according to the assumptions of the social actors themselves.80 According to Markovic "the full meaning" of a social phenomenon can be understood only when "intimate contacts are made with people."81 Epistemological-methodological categories, therefore, must be reflexive and viewed in terms of their limited validity and applicability. For the Praxis theorists, therefore, all activity and thought is dialectical, i.e., simultaneously subjective and objective.82 It should be noted (from Chapter Two) that Marx referred to the human individual as a simultaneously subjective and objective being, or a social being. It is in this same context that the Praxis Group uses the term social being. Likewise, the term praxis refers to social (subjective and objective) actions.

The Yugoslavs tend to emphasize quite succinctly that their humanistic ontology is not simply another form of idealism or a theory which cannot account for the
"realness" of many social phenomena. Social knowledge produced by a dialectical methodology is not merely subjective or relative. Borrowing from Husserl the Praxis writers note the intersubjective basis of all phenomena endows them with a power beyond mere individual opinion, but they are not viewed as, or fetishized into, universal prescripts. In Stojanovic's terms a social phenomenon should be viewed as a "concrete universal" not an abstract universal. In other words, the subversion of ontological dualism results in the subjective-objective/particular-universal interpenetration, and therefore each category has equal ontological status. The primary differentiation between subjectivity and objectivity is inter-subjectivity. A phenomenon can achieve the status of a concrete universal only through negotiation among social actors. It is this activity "... which has universal character and concerns each human individual." In Marx's terms it is in this universal activity that an individual is a species being.

The Yugoslav Marxist group formulated their model of social organization in response to two disturbing trends they identified as occurring in many contemporary, socialist societies. These trends are referred to as "statism" and the "atomization of social processes." Statism is defined as the model in which the state is
positioned as the regulating body under which all other social organization occurs. Even when the state is a body designed to regulate an egalitarian system it is still able to order the social in a hierarchical fashion, with order emanating from the top. However, the extreme atomization or decentralization of government is viewed by the Praxis theorists as a model which "opposes any planning and direction." A complex, industrialized society could not exist within the atomization model, since only relatively small, self-sustaining units are possible.

The model of social organization proposed by the Yugoslavs is called by Stojanovic an "integral social system." For Stojanovic an integral society processes to the 'poer of united individuals.' An integrated society is self-governed in every aspect, "horizontally and vertically." This implies that every task involving social "integration, coordination, regulation and planning" is accomplished (directly or by representation) by those individuals which these processes will effect. However, this does not imply, as Stojanovic suggests many fear, that atomization will result because no "general norms" can be formulated. On the contrary, self-government does not call for the "renunciation of general norms" but only "the transformation of the nature of the agent of these norms, and thus of their content." As noted above norms will
become general because of their status as concrete universals, not due to their validation by an abstract force. Therefore, for Stojanovic, all "state" organs, including the police and military, must be subjected to the authority of self-governed, integrated, intersubjectively united individuals. This is a democratized framework of a social model, in that, "the self-governors should themselves conceptualize the manner in which they will make decisions within their groups."

Conclusions: Further Analysis of the Responsive/Integrated Workplace

The focus of this dissertation has been to examine the various ontological-epistemological assumptions which have simultaneously produced the authoritarian workplace, and prevented the development of an alternative, democratic organization. The first five chapters have detailed the development of Rationalism through an examination of philosophical, sociological and management-oriented literature. This development involved the creation of a particular image or view of organization which consistently laid the groundwork to prevent democracy from operating legitimately in the workplace. The authoritarian social image of the workplace provided a foundation upon which various limiting structures would be based. The chapter on management theories provides a description of
the manner in which many of these mechanisms have been manifested. This final chapter has provided, by way of a summary description of the Rationalist workplace, a brief statement concerning the "democratization" of certain organizational structures. In other words, the initial section of this chapter attempts to outline the actual processual results of the movement away from authoritarian structures. In many instances this movement is not smooth, and new problems and shortcomings are encountered. Therefore, the ontological-epistemological shifts which must also be accomplished are presented in the subsequent section. Hopefully, the "responsive" ontological position illustrates the alternative social imagery which must accompany democratization of the workplace. The responsive social image does not provide a ready-made model of the democratic organization, it merely provides the basic assumptions which must be accepted if individuals are to be truly self-governing. This social imagery may be utilized to justify the very existence of democratic action in the workplace, and to provide a guideline for understanding the complications of implementing democratic processes.

The analysis included in this dissertation is at best only a preliminary statement concerning the development of a model of workplace democracy. At best it has only focused the image necessary for democracy in the workplace.
to be considered at all viable. Additional theoretical and empirical research is necessary to elucidate further the democratic context. Ideally, investigations should occur in both authoritarian, and at least partially democratized workplaces. In this sense evidence can be garnered as to whether the social imagery of the persons in the workplace corresponds to the organizational structures. In authoritarian workplaces partial replication of the Human Relations researchers' investigation of the type of "complaints" viewed as legitimate by workers and managers would yield important insight into the image of the workplace held by each group. In democratized workplaces similar ventures along with the types of investigations conducted by the Yugoslav sociologists would yield important clues to the actual process of democratizing an organization. This type of research would be most useful if it incorporated questions concernign the manner in which organizational and individual goals can be pursued simultaneously, without compromising either. In general much additional work related to the construction of social models of democracy is greatly needed. Sociologists can make important contributions to producing such models if they are willing to conduct research in a more reflexive manner. That is, to clearly articulate the social
ontological-epistemological assumptions they are fostering, and carefully outline the social implications of such a position.
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