

**THE RELEVANCE OF CHESTER I.
BARNARD'S TEACHINGS TO
CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT
EDUCATION: COMMUNICATING THE
AESTHETICS OF MANAGEMENT**

Joseph T. Mahoney

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 339
Wohlers Hall, 1206 South Sixth Street,
Champaign, IL 61820
Fax: 217-244-7969; E-mail: josephm@uiuc.edu

ABSTRACT

This paper explores why Barnard's teachings resonate intensely with current students of management at various levels in our management educational system. I argue that Barnard combines the two cultures of science and art and that it is the aesthetic reading of Barnard (1938) that explains the intensity of students' responses to his work. Barnard's book offers an intense, structured and coherent art form that depends on students using their capacities and readiness to apprehend the aesthetic experience of management based on the author's intimate habitual interested experience.

I. INTRODUCTION

As an educator who currently teaches Barnard's ideas to talented students in undergraduate, executive MBA, and Ph.D. courses, I observe that Barnard's teachings uniquely *inspire* many students at all educational levels. Barnard's teachings breathe life into the discipline of management and infuse a feeling of renewed idealism in the typical undergraduate, a feeling of renewed responsibility in the modern executive, and a sense of the importance of management in many current doctoral students. The *intensity* in which Barnard's writings resonate with current students at various levels in our management education system deserves attention and invites inquiry on why this is so.

Kenneth Andrews, an authoritative writer on Barnard, states that: "...*The Functions of the Executive* remains today, as it has been since its publication, the most thought-provoking book on organization and management ever written by a practicing executive" (1968: xxi). Andrews (1968) attributes the endurance of Barnard's teachings to: (1) his capacity for abstract thought; (2) his ability to apply reason to professional experiences; (3) his probable expertness in practice; and (4) the simultaneous exercise of the twin capabilities of reason and competence. I concur with Andrews (1968) and would add that Barnard was consciously contributing toward a "science of organization" (1938: 290). Yet the explanation for why Barnard's teachings *educate* students in the sense of "leading them out" to explore both who they are as individuals and their role in cooperative efforts remains elusive despite the large academic literature analyzing Barnard (1938).

I submit that Barnard inspires contemporary students because he provides them with an authentic *sense* of organization. Barnard, like none other in the history of management thought, combines the "two cultures"—the science of organization, and the art of organizing. More specifically, Barnard pushes the boundaries of exposition to convey the dramatic and *aesthetic feeling of managing*, which is derived from the "intimate habitual interested experience" (1938: xxxiv). Barnard writes that: "[The Executive Process] transcends the capacity of merely intellectual methods, and the techniques of discriminating the factors of the situation. The terms pertinent to it are 'feeling,' 'judgment,' 'sense,' 'proportion,' 'balance,' 'appropriateness.' It is a matter of art and it is aesthetic rather than logical" (1938: 235). Barnard genuinely helps the student at all levels to hear the tones so that they can appreciate the structure of an orchestrated plan, the art of its formulated composition, and the skill of its implementation. Students can better appreciate the rhythms of organizational life.¹

Section II of the current paper describes briefly Barnard the individual in order to place his teachings in context. Section III then discusses Barnard's teachings and their relevance to both the science and art of management. Particular attention is given to the concepts of leadership and responsibility. Section IV provides conclusions.

II. CHESTER BARNARD, THE INDIVIDUAL

Before focusing on Barnard's teachings, it is important to get a sense of Barnard the individual in order to place his teachings in context. Barnard (1886–1961) grew up in a working class family where Barnard describes his father as “a man of grammar school education; he was a mechanic, never made too much of any money; he was quite intelligent” (Wolf, 1973: 8). Later, Barnard's teachings will be examined with this background information in mind.² Family life for Barnard was filled with music and with discussions on philosophy and social views. Gabor writes that: “[Barnard's] personality reflected the contradictions of a poor boy who had grown up in a working-class household where ‘endless hours of arguments’ centered not on the perpetual lack of money but on books and philosophy” (2000: 71). In fact, Barnard's interest in philosophy was a life-long hobby for him. He read widely in philosophy and he was a member of the American Philosophical Society (Wolf, 1973: 58).

Andrews (1968: xvii) states that Barnard's teachings exhibited both “imagination and sympathy” that often are lacking in academic writings on management. One may conjecture that the contradictions of childhood for Barnard were a contributing factor to his fertile imagination. In terms of Barnard's feelings of sympathy toward others, his mother's death while in childbirth when Chester was five almost surely played a role.

Chester Barnard's personal integrity shines forth like a bright lantern in his writings and his thoughtful words of encouragement combined with his imagination and genuine concern for others are sources of inspiration. Scott (1992), for example, while often disagreeing with Barnard in terms of management philosophy states that Barnard's intellect, his vast accomplishments in business, government, philanthropy, and public service, his prodigious writing and his profound personal integrity impressed Scott beyond telling. Similarly, Gabor writes that: “Barnard's tenure at New Jersey Bell Telephone was marked by a sense of public service and personal integrity that are almost unimaginable to many today. For example, in 1933, at the height of the Depression, Barnard announced a no-layoff policy—a major achievement even within the Bell System—choosing to reduce employees' working hours instead. Such policies, combined with his

penchant for rolling up his sleeves and personally negotiating labor disputes, inspired an unusual level of employee loyalty” (2000: 73).³ With this brief discussion of Barnard’s background in place, we now consider Barnard’s teachings and their continuing relevance to management education.

III. BARNARD’S TEACHINGS

Barnard’s teachings reflect his intimate habitual interested experience in management. His teachings emphasize competence, moral integrity, rational stewardship, and professionalism. His writings show his ability in philosophy and theory building, a love of scholarship, the desire to put theory and practice on scientific foundations, and a strong sense of professional calling that connects ethical and practical teachings.⁴ Barnard wrote his book, *The Functions of the Executive*, for posterity. His seriousness of purpose is indicated by the fact that he rewrote the book “about eighteen or twenty times” (Wolf, 1973: 15). Further, his work schedule while writing the book involved eighteen hour days between business and other obligations and the writing of the book, and the maintenance of a critical attitude.

The impact of his work on organization theory is well documented (Scott, 1987; Williamson, 1995). Even those who take vigorous exception to Barnard’s views concede his vast influence in organization theory. Perrow writes that: “This . . . remarkable book contains within it the seeds of three distinct trends of organizational theory that were to dominate the field for the next three decades. One was the institutional theory as represented by Philip Selznick [1957]; another was the decision-making school as represented by Herbert Simon [1947]; the third was the human relations school” (1986: 63).

At a broad level, Barnard’s book reflects his wide readings in psychology, sociology, social psychology, economics, anthropology, law, political theory, and philosophy of science. Barnard presents a *systems* view of the organization⁵ that contains a psychological theory of motivation and behavior, a sociological theory of cooperation and complex interdependencies, and an ideology based on a meritocracy. Scott argues that: “The uniqueness of Barnard’s contribution stemmed from placing the concepts of behavior, motivation, and group processes into systems frameworks” (1992: 116).

Barnard’s *Functions of the Executive* provides a conceptual scheme of the theory of organization based on the *structural concepts* of: The Individual and Bounded Rationality; Cooperation; Formal Organization; Informal Organization. The *principal dynamic concepts* include: Free Will; Communication; Consent Theory of Authority; The Decision Process;

Dynamic Equilibrium and the Inducement-Contributions Balance; and Leadership, Executive Responsibility and Moral Codes. We will discuss each of these concepts in turn below, with special reference to the concepts of Leadership and Responsibility.

The Individual and Bounded Rationality. The individual is posited to be involved in activities that are the result of psychological factors. Persons have the power of choice, the capacity of determination, and the possession of free will. But, the individual is limited in terms of biological faculties or capacities (Barnard, 1938: 23). The organization as a cooperative system is seen as overcoming both the physical limitations and the cognitive limitations (bounded rationality) of the individual (Williamson, 1995).

Cooperation. Barnard writes that: "Cooperation . . . means genuine restraint of self in many directions, it means actual service for no reward, it means courage to fight for principles rather than for things, it means genuine subjection of destructive personal interest to social interests" (1992: 119). When the purpose of a system of cooperation is attained, then the cooperation is said to be *effective* (1938: 43). Cooperative effort is greatly limited if there is a lack of confidence in the sincerity and integrity of management. Barnard (1948: 11) maintains that:

When a condition of honesty and sincerity is recognized to exist, errors of judgment, defects of ability, are sympathetically endured. They are expected. Employees don't ascribe infallibility to leaders or management. What does disturb them is insincerity and the appearance of insincerity when the facts are not in their possession.

Formal Organization. Formal organization was studied by Barnard from a rational systems view: "Formal organization is that kind of cooperation among men that is conscious, deliberate, purposeful" (1938: 4). The formal organization is viewed as "a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons" (Barnard, 1938: 73). In Barnard's view the "creative side of organization is coordination" (Barnard, 1938: 256). Scott argues that while Barnard's views contain many ideas that are consistent with a "rational system conception of organizations; what sets them apart is his insistence on the nonmaterial, informal, interpersonal, and, indeed, moral basis of cooperation" (1987: 63). We will explore these non-economic concepts below.

Barnard also reminds us of the difficult task of achieving and maintaining a cooperative system: "successful cooperation in or by formal organization is the abnormal, not the normal condition. What are observed from day to day are the successful survivors among innumerable failures" (1938: 5). Within the formal organization, Barnard believed in the role of

genuine planning—a process of developing and applying knowledge and intelligence to our affairs.⁶

Informal Organization. Barnard maintains that: “‘Learning the organization ropes’ in most organizations is chiefly learning who’s who, what’s what, why’s why, of its informal society” (1938: 121). Barnard saw the role of the informal organization as complementary to the formal organization. The informal organization improves communication, enhances cohesiveness within the formal organization, and protects the integrity of the individual. Informal organization “is to be regarded as a means of maintaining the personality of the individual against certain effects of formal organizations which tend to disintegrate the personality” (1938: 122).⁷ To Barnard it is the responsibility of management to strike a balance between maintaining the individual and improving organizational effectiveness. Barnard argues that the element of the individual is of central consideration in the management of personnel and must be genuine rather than a high-sounding fiction for stimulating production. Hypocrisy, Barnard warns, is fatal in all personnel work (1948: 9).

Free Will. The concept of free will is central to Barnard’s theory of behavior and is derived from those moral and legal doctrines that stress personal responsibility for actions. His endorsement of the free will doctrine underlay all his arguments concerning management’s moral obligations. To Barnard, “the idea of free will is inculcated in doctrines of personal responsibility, of moral responsibility, and of legal responsibility. This seems necessary to preserve a sense of personal integrity” (1938: 13).

Communication. Barnard points out that a common purpose in an organization can only be achieved if it is commonly known, and to be known it must be communicated effectively in language, oral and written (Barnard, 1938: 89). Tacit understandings are also often essential (Barnard, 1938: 301–322).

Consent Theory of Authority. Management’s authority, Barnard realized, rested in its ability to persuade, rather than to command. Furthermore, Barnard emphasized that legitimate management authority is based on the grounds of functional skills and not hierarchical position (Gabor, 2000). A person in an organization accepts a communication as authoritative when: he can understand the communication; he believes that it is not inconsistent with the purpose of the organization; he believes it to be compatible with his personal interest as a whole; he is able mentally and physically to comply with it; and there exists a *zone of indifference* in each individual within which orders are acceptable without conscious questioning of their authority (1938: 165–167). Barnard notes that: “‘Either as a superior officer or as a subordinate, however, I know nothing that I actually regard as more ‘real’ than ‘authority’” (1938: 170).

Decision-making and the decision process. Although the organization theory literature on decision-making from Simon (1947) to the present is expansive, Barnard (1938: 189) provides us with his unique perspectives:

The making of decisions, as everyone knows from personal experience is a burdensome task. Offsetting the exhilaration that may result from correct and successful decision and the relief that follows the terminating of a struggle to determine issues is the depression that comes from failure or error of decision and the frustration which ensues from uncertainty.

Barnard warns of a tendency for personnel to avoid responsibility (due in part to fear of criticism) and that an executive must distribute responsibility, or otherwise run the risk of being overwhelmed with the burdens of decision. Barnard writes that: "The fine art of executive decision consists in not deciding questions that are not pertinent, in not deciding prematurely, in not making decision[s] that cannot be made effective, and in not making decisions that others should make" (1938: 194). Barnard returns to this theme in an interview granted in 1961 stating that: "You put a man in charge of an organization and your worst difficulty is that he thinks he has to tell everybody what to do; and that's almost fatal if it's carried far enough" (Wolf, 1973: 30).

Dynamic Equilibrium and the Inducement-Contributions Balance. To Barnard the efficiency and effectiveness of an organization depends upon what the organization secures and the personnel produce (the contributions) and how the organization distributes its resources (the inducements). The contributions and inducements are incessantly dynamic (Barnard, 1938: 57–59). Inducements include: material inducements, personal non-material opportunities; desirable physical conditions; ideal benefactions; associational attractiveness; adaptation of conditions to habitual methods and attitudes; the opportunity of enlarged participation; and the condition of communion (1938: 142). Barnard's emphasis was on non-economic motives. A passage contained in a volume of his collected papers helps explain why this is so (Barnard 1948: 15):

Prestige, competitive reputation, social philosophy, social standing, philanthropic interests, combativeness, love of intrigue, dislike of friction, technical interest, Napoleonic dreams, love of accomplishing useful things, desire for regard of employees, love of publicity, fear of publicity—a long catalogue of non-economic motives actually condition the management of business, and nothing but the balance sheet keeps these non-economic motives

from running wild. Yet without all these incentives, I think most business would be a lifeless failure.

Leadership, Executive Responsibility and Moral Codes. For Barnard much is given to leaders and much is expected. Leadership is the factor of chief significance in human cooperation. While cooperation is the creative process, leadership is the “indispensable fulminator of its forces” (Barnard, 1938: 259). The fundamental function of a leader is to create meaning for followers that will facilitate their commitment and identification. Barnard writes that: “The inculcation of belief in the real existence of a common purpose is an essential executive function” (1938: 87). Leadership, to Barnard, seems “connected with knowing whom to believe, with accepting the right suggestions, with selecting appropriate occasions and times . . . —an understanding that leads to distinguishing effectively between the important and the unimportant *in the particular concrete situation*, between what can and what cannot be done, between what will probably succeed and what will probably not, between what will weaken cooperation and what will increase it” (Barnard, 1948: 86–87).

Leadership then must go beyond deciding what the right thing to do is, and to move onto the job of getting it done. Barnard states that: “An executive is a teacher; most people don’t think of him that way, but that’s what he is. He can’t do very much unless he can teach people. . . . You can’t just pick out people and stick them in a job and say go ahead and do it. You’ve got to give them a philosophy to work against, you’ve got to state the goals, you’ve got to indicate the limitations and the methods” (Wolf, 1973: 7–8). Leadership then involves the guidance of conduct of others. Leaders need to be more effective than others both in conveying meanings and intentions and in receiving them with sympathetic understanding (1948: 97–99). Barnard (1948: 109–110) describes the nature of leadership, stating that:

It is in the nature of a leader’s work that he should be a realist and should recognize the need for action, even when the outcome cannot be foreseen, but also that he should be idealist and in the broadest sense pursue goals some of which can only be attained in a succeeding generation of leaders. Many leaders when they reach the apex of their powers have not long to go, and they press onward by paths the ends of which they will not themselves reach. In business, in education, in government, in religion, again and again, I see men who, I am sure, are dominated by this motive, though unexpressed, and by some queer twist of our present attitudes often disavowed. Yet, *‘Old men [and old women] plant trees.’* . . . to shape the present for the future by the surplus of thought and purpose which we now

can muster seems the very expression of the idealism which underlies such social coherence as we presently achieve, and without this idealism we see no worthy meaning in our lives, our institutions, or our culture.⁸

In the expression, “old men [and old women] plant trees” Barnard indicates that the moral factor is real and that faith in others can be supported by observation. Within the cooperative system, the moral factor finds its concrete expression and suggests the necessity of leadership and “*the power of individuals to inspire cooperative personal decision by creating faith* (emphasis added): faith in common understanding, faith in the probability of success, faith in the ultimate satisfaction of personal motives, faith in the integrity of objective authority, faith in the superiority of common purpose as a personal aim of those who partake in it” (Barnard, 1938: 259).

For Barnard, the part of leadership that determines the *quality* of action is responsibility. Responsibility is the “quality which gives dependability and determination to human conduct, and foresight and ideality to purpose” (1938: 260). Responsibility is the most important function of the executive. Responsibility means honor and faithfulness in the manner that managers carry out their duties. Barnard defines responsibility as an “emotional condition that gives an individual a sense of acute dissatisfaction because of failure to do what he feels he is morally bound to do or because of doing what he thinks he is morally bound not to do, in particular concrete situations” (1948: 95). Carrying out this function also helps build the character of the executive who must practice deciding and acting under the burden of responsibility. Barnard in 1961, looking backward on his classic states that: “In my opinion, the great weakness of my book is that it doesn’t deal adequately with the question of responsibility and its delegation. The emphasis is too much on authority, which is the subordinate subject. . . . The emphasis is put on authority which, to me now, is a secondary, derivative setup” (Wolf, 1973: 15).

Ultimately, Barnard argues that: “nearly everything depends upon the moral commitment. I’m perfectly confident that, with occasional lapses, if I make a date with you, whom I have never met, you’ll keep it and you’ll feel confident that I’ll keep it; and there’s absolutely nothing binding that makes us do it. And yet the world runs on that—you just couldn’t run a college, you couldn’t run a business, you couldn’t run a church, couldn’t do anything except on the basis of the moral commitments that are involved in what we call responsibility. You can’t operate a large organization unless you can delegate responsibility, not authority but responsibility” (Wolf, 1973: 35). Ethical practice determines management’s moral authority and the capability of managers to pass their power on to the next generation

(Scott, 1992: 90).⁹ Barnard writes that: “responsibility is the property of an individual by which whatever morality exists in him becomes effective in conduct” (1938: 267).

For Barnard the survival of the organization as a going concern depends on moral commitment. Barnard writes that: “Organizations endure, however, in proportion to the breadth of morality by which they are governed. This is only to say that foresight, long purposes, high ideals are the basis for the persistence of cooperation” (1938: 282).

Barnard argued for combining the two cultures of management—its science and its art.¹⁰ Thus, he called for “a social anthropology, a sociology, a social psychology, an institutional economics, a treatise on management” (1938: 293) in developing the “science of organization.” However, Barnard warns that we should not deceive ourselves by thinking that a science of organization will be enough: “Inspiration is necessary to inculcate the sense of unity, and to create common ideals. Emotional rather than intellectual acceptance is required” (1938: 293).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

This paper summarizes the major elements of Barnard’s theory with special attention to his concepts of leadership and responsibility. In answering the question of why Barnard’s writings resonate with current students at various levels in our management education system, Simon (1947) and Williamson (1995) emphasize Barnard’s contributions to the “science of organization” while, following Selznick (1957), Levitt and March write that Barnard’s *The Functions of the Executive* is “poetic and evocative” (1995: 11). Barnard’s thesis is that management requires both art and science and his masterpiece achieves this balance. Barnard’s work is enriching when read for the practical purpose of understanding the science of management, but it is the aesthetic reading of Barnard (1938) that, I believe, explains the *intensity* of students’ responses to his work. Barnard’s book offers an intense, structured and coherent art form that depends on students using their capacities and readiness to apprehend the aesthetic experience of management based on the author’s intimate habitual interested experience. Barnard dedicates his book to his father and writes that: “At a crisis in my youth, he taught me the wisdom of choice: To try and fail is at least to learn; to fail to try is to suffer the inestimable loss of what might have been.” Toward his purpose of conveying the aesthetic experience of management, Barnard not only did not fail to try, he did not fail.

I end this paper with Barnard’s finale on the last page of the body of his text as an exemplar of the “poetic and evocative” nature of his work:

This study, without the intent of the writer or the expectation of the reader, had at its heart this deep paradox and conflict of feelings in the lives of men. Free and unfree, controlling and controlled, choosing and being chosen, inducing and unable to resist inducement, the source of authority and unable to deny it, independent and dependent, nourishing their personalities, and yet depersonalized; forming purposes and being forced to change them, searching for limitations in order to make decisions, seeking the particular but concerned with the whole, finding leaders and denying their leadership, hoping to dominate the earth and being dominated by the unseen—this is the story of man in society told in these pages. Such a story calls finally for a declaration of faith. I believe in the power of the cooperation of men of free will to make men free to cooperate; that only as they choose to work together can they achieve the fullness of personal development; that only as each accepts a responsibility for choice can they enter into the communion of men from which arise the higher purposes of individual and of cooperative behavior alike. I believe that the expansion of cooperation and the development of the individual are mutually dependent realities, and that a due proportion or balance between them is a necessary condition of human welfare. Because it is subjective with respect both to society as a whole and to the individual, what this proportion is I believe science cannot say. It is a question for philosophy and religion.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I thank Steve Michael for comments on an earlier draft of this paper. The usual disclaimer applies.

END NOTES

1. Barnard (1938: xxxiv) uses the metaphor of a Symphony to convey his views on the importance of the aesthetic experience in management. Barnard had much experience with both *management* (e.g., serving as the first president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company starting in 1927 at the age of 41 and as president of the Rockefeller Foundation from 1948 to 1952.) and *music* (which was emphasized in his family upbringing). His life-long hobby was music, and to that end he was active in the founding of the Bach Society of New Jersey and the Newark Art Theater.

2. While beyond the scope of the current paper, it is this author's view that the interpretation of Barnard's teachings as elitist (see e.g., Perrow, 1986; Scott, 1992) can certainly be challenged by looking at Barnard's background and providing a more balanced assessment of his teachings. That readers can differ so greatly in the interpretation of Barnard's (1938) text can be understood better by reading another famous book published in 1938, this one written by Louise Rosenblatt. This book is a seminal work leading to what educational scholars today call "reader response theory."
3. For an example of Barnard's direct personal experience in labor negotiations see "Riot of the Unemployed at Trenton, N.J. 1935" (Barnard, 1948, chapter 3). The majority of men that he negotiated with were mechanics (1948: 70). It is noteworthy to recall while reading this chapter that Barnard's father was a mechanic. Barnard's background enabled him to identify with the workers, to "understand [the workers'] language" (1948: 75), to connect with the workers' non-economic sentiments, and finally to reach a settlement of economic terms which Barnard regarded as "quite subordinate" to the non-economic factors of the need for action and the desire of workers to build up personal integrity (1948: 77).
4. Barnard had a sense of a calling and responsibility at an early age. In his letter of application to Mount Hermon School to his headmaster, Barnard wrote: "this dormant thirst for a larger education was awakened by my conversion to the Lord Jesus Christ, when I felt that I had capabilities which needed developing for his use. And that is now my ultimate aim—to be used of Him and to make the most of my life for Him" (Scott, 1992: 62).
5. Barnard was highly influenced by systems thinking. In a talk to students at Johns Hopkins University in 1953 he noted that: "I have read [Ross Ashby's *Design for a Brain*] five times and I am certainly going to read it five more" (Andrews, 1968: xiii). To Barnard, a system is characterized by the fact that the components to a system are interdependent variables (1938: 77–78).
6. Although Barnard emphasized purposive adaptation and planning, he also was aware of the high-powered incentives of markets. Barnard writes that: "Pareto, a leading mathematical economist of the [nineteenth] century . . . noted that for a society of 40,000,000 people and several thousand products, the number of [simultaneous] equations would be fabulous. This led him to remark that the simplest practicable solution was the market, not the mathematician" (Barnard: 1948: 139).
7. Gabor (2000: 79) writes: "It is interesting to note that one of the 'newest' management initiatives in high-tech industries, at companies such as Xerox and National Semiconductor, is an attempt to tap the knowledge of the 'informal organization' by developing so-called communities of

practice. . . . Communities of practice involve informal groups of software designers who are encouraged to get together to brainstorm ideas *without* a managerial agenda. . . . For the members of the informal group, the communities of practice serve as the ultimate meritocracy wherein an employee becomes part of the group because his or her peers recognize his or her ability to help solve a challenging problem.’

8. Barnard's conclusion brings to mind the following passage from T.S. Eliot's *The Idea of a Christian Society* that Barnard (1948: 83) quotes: The fact that a problem will certainly take a long time to solve, and that it will demand the attention of many minds for several generations, is no justification for postponing the study. And, in times of emergency, it may prove in the long run that the problems we have postponed or ignored, rather than those we have failed to attack successfully, will return to plague us. Our difficulties of the moment must always be dealt with somehow; but our permanent difficulties are difficulties of every moment.
9. Following in Barnard's footsteps, Mahoney, Huff and Huff argue that: "Altruism, ethics, goodwill, moral sentiments, and trust need to be placed in the foreground of our vision, and society must be accepted as the ultimate principal to which both individuals and firms are responsible" (1994: 153).
10. In terms of the importance of the "art" of management, Barnard concludes his text by quoting a passage from Plato's *Laws*:
 Anyone who sees all this, naturally rushes to the conclusion of which I was speaking, that no mortal legislates in anything, but that in human affairs chance is almost everything. And this may be said of the arts of the sailor, and the pilot, and the physician, and the general, and may seem to be well said; and yet there is another thing which may be said with equal truth of all of them. What is it?
 That God governs all things, and that chance and opportunity cooperate with Him in the government of human affairs. There is, however, a third and less extreme view, that art should be there also; for I should say that in a storm there must surely be a great advantage in having the aid of the pilot's art. You would agree?

REFERENCES

- Andrews, K.R. Introduction to the Thirtieth Anniversary Edition of *The Functions of the Executive*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 1968.

- Ashby, W. Ross *Design for a Brain*; John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1960.
- Barnard, C.I. *The Functions of the Executive*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, Thirtieth Anniversary Edition, 1938.
- Barnard, C.I. *Organization and Management: Selected Papers*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 1948.
- Eliot, T.S. *The Idea of a Christian Society*; Harcourt, Brace & Company: New York, 1940.
- Gabor, A. *The Capitalist Philosophers: The Geniuses of Modern Business—Their Lives, Times, and Ideas*; Random House: New York, 2000.
- Levitt, B.; March, J.G. Chester Barnard and the Intelligence of Learning. In *Organization Theory: From Chester Barnard to the Present and Beyond*; Williamson, O.E., Ed.; Oxford University Press: New York, 1995; 11–37.
- Mahoney, J.T.; Huff, A.S.; Huff, J.O. Toward a New Social Contract Theory in Organization Science. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **1994**, 3 (2), 153–168.
- Perrow, C. *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*; Random House: New York, 1986.
- Rosenblatt, L.M. *Literature as Exploration*; D Appleton-Century Company: New York, 1938.
- Scott, W.G. *Chester I. Barnard and the Guardians of the Managerial State*; University of Kansas Press: Lawrence, Kansas, 1992.
- Scott, W.R. *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems*; Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliff, N.J., 1987.
- Selznick, P. *Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation*; University of California Press: Berkeley, CA, 1957.
- Simon, H.A. *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*; Free Press: New York, 1947.
- Williamson, O.E. Chester Barnard and the Incipient Science of Organization. In *Organization Theory: From Chester Barnard to the Present and Beyond*; Williamson, O.E., Ed.; Oxford University Press: New York, 1995; 172–206.
- Wolf, W.B. *Conversations with Chester I. Barnard*; School of Industrial and Labor Relations: Cornell University, ILR Paperback Number Twelve, Ithaca, NY, 1973.

