Editorial

Paul Griseri¹

Published online: 23 March 2015
© Springer International Publishing AG 2015

Welcome to the relaunched *Philosophy of Management*. Regular readers will find much that is changed and much that remains the same. The physical presentation of the journal is different, *gratia* our new publishers, Springer. The management behind the scenes is also different, thanks to the automated Editorial Manager system that deals with the review process, and will doubtless lead to a much more efficient and smooth handling of submissions. The basic motivation behind the journal, however, remains the same—to deepen an understanding of business and organisations by bringing to bear the concepts, arguments and techniques of philosophy on the subject matter of management. And the content will continue to reflect this, construing ‘philosophy’ broadly, to include not only the major European-derived traditions, such as analytic philosophy or phenomenology, but also wider sources such as the work of East Asian and South Asian thinkers, and drawing from the full history of the subject over the last two and a half millennia.

The overall editorial policy of the Executive Editorial team will continue, with a preference for clearly written and accessible material that is well exemplified from managerial experiences, an expectation that arguments will directly connect with established philosophical concepts and debates, and an encouragement for ideas from around the globe. Whilst the general approach to handling submissions will become more automated, we intend to retain the developmental aspect of feedback to authors, preferring revision—even where this is extensive—to rejection, which we will continue to regard as a loss to the world of ideas, rather than (as some journals seem to view it) a proof of our intellectual muscle.

This first issue of Volume 14 comprises papers delivered at last year’s Philosophy of Management conference, which took place at De Paul University, Chicago. Many thanks are due to Ed Freeman and Pat Werhane for organising this, and also thanks to Pat’s team, especially Summer Brown, for the effective management of the conference. This was the first Philosophy of Management conference to take place outside of Europe, and it was instructive to note that the balance of different schools and traditions of philosophy, as well as the profile of participants, was not radically different from previous conferences. The five papers here represent the first tranche of papers from this conference, and it is anticipated that further

✉ Paul Griseri
p.griseri@mdx.ac.uk

¹ Middlesex University, London, UK

papers from this event will be published in due course. As conference papers, some of these differ slightly in tone from a standard academic journal submission, but we felt that it was important to publish these in a form that may bear the mark of their origins as bases for discussion and debate, which is after all the stuff of philosophy.

Perhaps more so than in previous conferences, there were emergent thematic concerns that came out over and over again in discussions as well as in papers. Chief amongst these was a critical view of the philosophical infrastructure lying behind neo-liberal economics. For years neo-liberalism has been a focus of critical attention in many professional, political and academic debates, but perhaps just because that attention has yet to have made much of an impact on business and the financial markets, and because also the unstable condition of the global economy over the last 8 years shows no sign of abating, this field of critique is a recurring source of interest—maybe in the hope that a dripping tap will eventually erode the monolith that is contemporary political economy.

One key component of that philosophical infrastructure is the tendency to view human nature as stripped down to bare elemental functions—*homo economicus*, characterised in terms of unrestricted wants and a means-ended rationality unfettered by sentiment or moral sensitivity. Edwin Hartmann, in his keynote address to the conference, contrasts this with the Aristotelian conception of *phronesis*—practical wisdom—arguing that the latter is not an automatic application of rules but a reflection of an individual's character. This contrasts with the mechanistic conception of human activity depicted by the *homo economicus* model, determined by desires and beliefs, and mediated only by reason construed narrowly as calculative of means to achieve ends.

An important shift that Hartmann makes in the language of reason is away from *calculation* towards *deliberation*. This implies a sense of what it is to think about what to do which is richer than how can I get what I want, and more concerned with *what* to want. It is growing more common to argue that the divide between ethical theories (such as deontological and teleological ethics) is less yawning a gulf than has been previously supposed, or at least to suggest that bridges across the gap are less difficult to build than formerly: Hartmann does not labour this but in places he seems to be sympathetic to it, with some suggestions of Kantian-style aspects of Aristotle's conception of practical reason.

Hartmann makes a number of comments that bear on the teaching in business schools. This is brought more directly into central focus in Duane Windsor's discussion of the disciplines of ethics, economics and management. He notes the characteristic presentation of ethics as being in opposition to, or at least as a constraint upon, business activity, and examines the effect of this in relation to the basic idea of being a manager, as well as its impact in the typical MBA curriculum. The sub-title of Windsor's paper 'turf, reputation, coalition' reflects key political skills and attitudes whose ethical aspects are under-represented in business schools. Windsor's conclusion is optimistic—that ethics, economics and management can be integrated, made compatible, without resorting to a narrow neo-liberalism, and this is supported by his many examples of corporate decisions based on other than simple acquisitive motives.

In *Ghoshal's Ghost* Alex Sagar and Gregory Daneke continue the examination of aspects of teaching in business schools. They note that the critique made by Sumantra Ghoshal 10 years ago has not made much of a dent in the continuing progress of neo-liberalism and what they call 'Finance Über Alles.' They argue for a different kind of theoretical framework, one which integrates more realistic views of human nature, of the firm and of the wider socio-political context. It is in the latter, the authors argue, and in particular a context rooted in a conception of social justice, that the future direction of management education needs to lie.

This marks an interesting contrast with the arguments of Hartmann and Windsor, for whom the political dimension is, whilst certainly not absent, at an apparently lower level of priority than the understanding of individual reason and development. Not that such a distinction can be held too rigidly—from Aristotle onwards there has been a recognition amongst philosophers that an individual is in part only to be understood in terms of their social relationships, and both Hartmann and Windsor in their different ways take account of this. Nevertheless, the question of social and political power relationships, as envisaged by critical management studies, could be usefully brought into this discussion.

Matthias Huehn takes this critical examination a step further, looking at the way in which economics as a discipline has moved steadily further away from philosophy since the time of Adam Smith. He takes the analysis further also in using the wider term *homo economicus syntheticus* as the basic element in neo-liberal economic theory, specifically underlining what is implicit in the earlier papers (that this idea is a construct with only a limited connection with the reality of human experiences of choice). He also follows other writers in arguing that Smith has been widely misinterpreted—identifying a ‘Kirkcaldy’ Smith to contrast with the ‘Chicago’ Smith of the neo-liberal school of economics. Tracing the development of economics from Smith, through a classical and then a neoclassical phase, to the modern phase that emerged over the course of the middle decades of the twentieth century, he argues that a concern to present economics as an ethically ‘neutral’ science has pulled the discipline away from a philosophical enquiry into its fundamentals—a neglect that has meant that those far-from-neutral assumptions that underpin modern economics go unchallenged and unannounced. He concludes with a clarion call for the (re)introduction of philosophy into the study of business.

Caleb Bernaccio looks at a different aspect of what we are calling here the infrastructure of neo-liberal economics, namely the various conceptions of corporate governance and the underlying assumptions they make regarding agency. Specifically the contrast between US and European models in respect of employee participation implies a position on the relationship between ethics and business. This brings us back to the same ground that Hartmann was discussing, concerning the nature of practical reason and whether it goes beyond means-ended calculation, which here Bernaccio correctly links with an Humean interpretation of the distinction between facts and values. Drawing on Macintyre and others, Bernaccio outlines a conception of agency related to the different narratives that can be given of any action, and via this he develops a dialogue based conception of governance.

As stated earlier, all these papers can be related in one way or another to the underpinning structure of assumptions that give some degree of traction to neo-liberal economics. However, they also all have a challenge to the dominance of this approach to contemporary business school curricula. This is not an accidental correlation of ideas. Philosophical thinking is manifested in debate and discussion, and although its search for truth is very different from that of, say, natural science, it carries the same necessity to be developed publicly. We have few genuinely open public spaces for free and honest debate: despite the good intentions of many in the broadcast, printed and electronic media, the structure of their environments precludes a serious treatment of most of the really challenging questions. Postgraduate study is one of the few places where adults with well formed and well informed views about business, society or humanity, can present their views in a safe environment that encourages honesty, critique (in the best senses of the term) and growth. That even in these institutions, which should be palaces of open debate, we are tied to an ever-narrowing range of thoughts, is a disturbing phenomenon which needs to be confronted. These papers, in their own different ways, are doing just this. We look forward to extending these debates.

Paul Griseri is the Managing Editor of *Philosophy of Management*. He is a senior manager with responsibility for MBA programmes and other academic projects at Middlesex University Business School. He has published seven books, of which the most recent is *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Management*.