

Harvard Business Review

January-February, 1953

This is the modern heresy: that it is not enough to be good, to lead a blameless life; we must also be creative.

↔ Business Leadership and a Creative Society

By Abram T. Collier

High on the list of tasks facing the business administrator are those relating to the basic attitudes, interests, and objectives of his employees. Meeting antagonism and misunderstanding, as he often does, his immediate reaction is to cry out: "How can I get across to my employees some understanding of the objectives I seek?" Well, that question may be important, but perhaps it should not have such priority. It might be better to ask first: "What, in truth, do I seek? What objectives do I have that my employees can also share?"

Some administrators, of course, have not bothered their heads with such intricate problems, feeling that "only results count" or "actions speak louder than words." But advertising and public relations men have demonstrated how in-

adequate this view is; words and the things they connote are as much a part of our experience as the things that we perceive immediately and directly. And top-rank administrators such as Chester I. Barnard know also that one of the first and greatest functions of leadership is that the leader express for his group the ideals toward which they all, consciously or unconsciously, strive.

Winston Churchill's powerful "blood, sweat, and tears" speech in 1940 has now become a classic model in the political field of the way in which a leader can express the purpose of the people and rally them to common effort. Businessmen, especially those of us concerned with personnel, productivity, and morale, have come to recognize the need for much the same kind of leadership, convinced that only in this way will employees ever have the satisfaction of really feeling they are identified with the enterprise for which they work.

But in seeking to exert such leadership we have already learned that there are some difficult

problems of communication in the way. Take the many attempts that have been made in recent years, following the example of such companies as du Pont, General Electric, and Republic Steel, to give supervisors and workers in business some understanding of the economic and political society in which we live. The general experience is that the terms "capitalism," "competition," "American way of life," "land of opportunity," and "free private enterprise," through excessive repetition, abuse, or otherwise, have lost much of their capacity to convey the meaning intended.

Moreover, where new symbols have been introduced for the old, they too have missed the mark. The editors of *Fortune*, for example, have characterized our society as the "permanent revolution," but we do not think of ourselves as revolutionaries — at least not of the black-bearded and bomb-carrying kind. Other attempts to call our society "open" or "free" have raised the perplexing questions: Open for what? Free for what?

It seems to me that we businessmen ought to aim at articulating an ideology that, in addition to being an accurate expression of management goals, is a little closer to the personal and even religious aspirations of the people than anything we have espoused in the past. Is it not possible that we have been thinking too much in terms of systems, of economics, of products, of laws? Perhaps these approaches should not have failed as they did; perhaps they can be improved. But in any event it seems to me that the fact of their failure (or, at best, their lack of any great success) should be accepted, and that the most profitable line of inquiry is to turn to a different sort of approach altogether.

The Creative Ideal

Accordingly, I put forward this simple proposition: that our society is a creative society; that its prime objective, as well as its great genius, is its creativeness; and that, as creative accomplishment is the actual day-to-day goal of modern business, it is also the keystone of our business philosophy.

I am thinking of creativeness in its widest and deepest sense. Thus, business does not exist merely to produce more goods and services, or better goods and services for more people, though that is no small part of its task. Business also,

particularly in these days, affords the principal or the only means whereby individual men may gain the satisfaction of accomplishing something more than merely sustaining their own lives. Pleasure, power, and fame appear to be but by-products of the efforts we make to be useful members of society and to leave it with something more than it had when we arrived. Perhaps we leave only the grain of sand that Robert Frost said he wished to leave on the beach of history; but at least, if we do that, we can feel that we have fulfilled our role in living.

What I am suggesting is that the great goals of happiness, freedom, security — even goodness and truth — are values which should be viewed as subordinate to, and resulting from, a new and positive creative ideal. Our people in business and elsewhere seem to be driven by an urge to build; by a longing to explore and reach out; by a desire to realize, through men and for men, such things and experiences as humanity has never known before. In this light, our vaunted freedoms of thought and action, our sought-for freedoms from worry and want, and even our ethical standards of behavior (products as they are of other places and times) are not ends in themselves; rather they emerge as important values just because they support and make possible a creative society of men.

This is the modern heresy: that it is not enough to be good, to lead a blameless life; we must also be creative.

The New and the Old

In one sense this ideal is modern in expression only. Wise men in almost every age have been trying to tell us that the greatest individual satisfaction there is comes from a job well done. Samuel Johnson, for example, observed: "Life affords no higher pleasure than that of surmounting difficulties, passing from one step of success to another, forming new wishes and seeing them gratified." And Emerson said: "The *sum* of wisdom is that the time is never lost that is devoted to work."

In another sense, however, this ideal of ours shows some new, significantly new, aspects. Specifically in American business it is now beginning to be recognized that *everyone* has the capacity for the satisfaction that comes from creative accomplishment. As science unleashes vast new sources of power, it appears possible for the first time in history for men of all types

and classes to avoid the toil and suffering of hard labor and to experience the joys of work — a satisfaction which in times past was limited to the few.

Contrast this with the older view. We used to classify as creative only those accomplishments that certain individuals could achieve. The writer, the artist, the composer, the scientist — in other words, the rare people who had the genius to find and express new ideas or new truths — were considered the creative members of our society; the classic examples have been the Newtons, the Beethovens, the Kants, the Michelangelos, the Shakespeares. The magnitude of their work often crushed us by making us feel our own inadequacy.

Today, however, we are beginning to recognize that creative work may be accomplished collectively as well as individually. The great and small organizations that have built and operated our industrial plants, farms, transportation and communication networks, financial systems, and distributive organizations, all are examples of the creative genius which comes from the collective effort of administrators and workers, as well as specialists of all degrees.

Dimension of the Task

The first task of business leaders, therefore, is to create an environment in which there can flourish not only individual genius but, more important, the collective capacities of other people in the organization. Some difficult and searching questions must be answered if this task is to be accomplished. What are the basic positive forces operating in a creative business society? What generates their power? What keeps them in balance? What conditions their survival? What controls their direction?

To this end, I should like to submit that the creative ideal depends on the following concepts:

(1) That the forces in business (and many other types of organization) are nurtured by the existence of *differences between individuals and groups*.

(2) That these forces are kept in control and balance by the process of *individuals understanding each other*.

(3) That a creative society depends for its survival upon the belief that *rights must be matched by obligations*.

(4) That the directing force in a creative society is the *faith* of its members in *individual growth*.

The Power of Difference

In considering the importance of individual differences, it should first be noted that the goal of many societies — including the goal of Communist society today and of almost every Utopia that has ever been conceived, from Plato to Aldous Huxley — has been to compel men to conform. The theory is that if everyone is induced to accept the same ideas of what is good and proper, conflicts between men and groups of men will disappear and humanity will live happily ever after.

By contrast, one of the cornerstones on which the creative society is built is the incontrovertible fact that men are different, that they cherish these differences, that the joy and fascination of life depends on the existence of differences, and that there are great social values in differences.

Driving Force

Every great ideal has its own theory of the nature of man. The wholly competitive or acquisitive society, which is gone (if it ever in fact existed), assumed that man was motivated only by his own pleasure, that he was egoistic and greedy, and that his wants were insatiable. By assuming that the average man, the economic man, was moved by animal impulses, it was possible to work out satisfactory theoretical explanations of how men acted in the market place.

On the other hand, socialists have assumed, following the notions of Rousseau (and possibly the story of Genesis), that man was essentially good, self-sacrificing, considerate, and loving, but was corrupted by social institutions. On this basis they thought that if institutions were changed or destroyed and if nonconforming individuals and classes were eliminated, then all social problems would cease and the state could and would wither away.

But in a creative society neither of these views is adequate. We observe that men are both egoistic and self-sacrificing — and many things more. While men are, taken as a whole, driven by an urge to create and grow, their characteristics vary with their times, experiences, culture, inheritance, and with all the other circumstances in which they find themselves. To illustrate with a simple example:

In the company with which I am associated we are using, as an aid in selection and placement, a

test of personality or temperament in which the results are described not in imprecise words but in graphic form. Taking several major behavior characteristics, it plots with a fair degree of accuracy where a given individual falls on each of several temperament spectra. For instance, there is a spectrum of gregariousness in which the extreme extrovert falls at one end and the extreme introvert at the other; in between are those having various needs for sociability or a capacity to live within themselves.

Thousands upon thousands of tests of this type have been made, and it is fair to say that in no two cases have the results — the combinations of characteristics on the several spectra — been exactly the same. Similarity of types may be observed, but every man and every woman is found to be unique. Furthermore, research into personality shows that men change their personalities, usually extremely slowly but sometimes dramatically. It also shows that behavior is not wholly a matter for the individual alone but depends in large part on the situation in which he finds himself. That is, the set of values according to which he makes his decisions may vary with his external circumstances.

The driving force of difference — in individuals and in groups — seems well illustrated by the history of the United States and Canada (in contrast to some other countries). While no doubt we have strong forces in many companies, labor unions, churches, and schools which are trying to enforce a high degree of conformity to some particular viewpoint, practice, or belief, nevertheless those forces have been observably less dominant than the forces of individual integrity. In our business world, if a man has felt that he could do a job better than someone else, he has been free to try; indeed, the fact that he saw things differently has given him both the opportunity and the courage to try.

Moreover, there is good reason to believe that the differences between groups of people in the United States and Canada with respect to cultural, racial, and religious backgrounds have been a factor in the dynamic development of these countries. What does it mean that never before in history have so many diverse religious groups been able to live together with so little disharmony? Has our society progressed *in spite of* differences or *because of* them? Possibly the very existence of differences among various people and groups has given people the courage

to disagree with prevailing opinions. Every discovery, every invention, every new industry, every new idea has come about because some person or some group of people has had the courage as well as the insight to disagree with the majority or do what the majority has not thought of doing before. This is perhaps part of what David McCord Wright had in mind when he pointed out:

"Our dilemma . . . is that if we make men 'free,' they will become creative and from their creations will spring the probability of growth and the certainty of trouble."¹

Diversity rather than Conflict

Differences do, of course, lead to trouble — to misunderstanding and conflict. Yet conflict is essential to constructive work. More than a generation ago Mary Parker Follett, a woman who has since become recognized for her many profound insights into the nature of business organizations, wrote:

"What people often mean by getting rid of conflict is getting rid of diversity, and it is of the utmost importance that these should not be considered the same. We may wish to abolish conflict, but we cannot get rid of diversity. We must face life as it is and understand that diversity is its most essential feature. . . . Fear of difference is dread of life itself. It is possible to conceive conflict as not necessarily a wasteful outbreak of incompatibilities but a *normal* process by which socially valuable differences register themselves for the enrichment of all concerned."²

Creativeness in an organization depends to a large extent on people who are not too ready to agree. In our own experience, most of us abhor the attitude of "Well, if you're going to argue about it, let's do it your way." We have found that we must have diversity of opinion, firmly as well as fairly expressed, if our business is to make the wise decisions that will enable it to develop and grow.

If we accept difference, it necessarily follows that we are not sure we are right ourselves; we accept the notion that our conclusions about people and society must be treated only as working hypotheses and that there are realities beyond those of our immediate perceptions. It is sometimes forgotten how highly we esteem this con-

¹ *The Impact of the Union* (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1951), p. 274.

² *Creative Experiences* (New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1924), pp. 300, 301.

cept in the physical sciences. The entire atomic world of neutrons and electrons has never been perceived directly; despite Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it is still a theory or a working hypothesis. The same hypothetical character pertains to all of our knowledge about genes — the transmission of traits from organisms to their offspring.

But if it is necessary to trust to more than our immediate perceptions in the physical sciences, it would seem even more important to do so in social, ethical, and political matters that deal with human beings. The observation of Yale's F. C. S. Northrop, that the ability to live in a world of both immediate perceptions and unperceived hypotheses is the essence of the genius of the West, would apply no less to our industrial and political society than to our scientific progress.

This means that we must subject our old concepts of right and wrong, of good and bad, to a radical change; things are no longer so black and white. Judge Learned Hand, philosopher as well as judge, has described the spirit of liberty as "the spirit that is not too sure that it is right." Tolerance for difference, for the viewpoint that we do not agree with, implies that we are not so sure of our own. We accept our principles of action as working hypotheses, realizing that something may happen to lead us to revise these opinions. While it often sounds as though some of our friends would never change their opinions (particularly on matters of ethics or politics), our great genius lies in the fact that we may talk loudly but, when the chips are down, we seem to act on the basis that all general rules of what is right and wrong must be tempered by common sense.

It can be reasonably contended that the great upheavals of modern history — its wars and its revolutions — are not so much the result of differences between people as of the feeling of a nation or a class that its capacity for creative expression is in some way threatened or thwarted. This was one cause of the Russian revolt of 1917, although the revolutionaries themselves later made the great and historic blunder of seeking to abolish conflict by abolishing difference rather than by accepting difference and in that way removing the barriers to creative work.

Nations such as ours, that have insisted on the freedom of their people to be different, have

had to fight and may well fight again to preserve their right to disagree with one another. Yet, if the principle of difference is one of the cornerstones of creativeness, our society has little to fear *in the long run* from the Stalins who deny the privilege of difference to their own people.

Process of Understanding

If diversity is the first condition of the creative society, then understanding is the second. The Bible's exhortation, "with all thy getting, get understanding," is particularly appropriate for modern industry. If for their dynamic creative power our businesses depend on continuing differences in viewpoint, for balance and braking power they must equally depend on understanding, on the felt necessity for securing agreement and cooperation.

In the sense that I am using the term, understanding refers both to self-understanding and understanding of others. Self-awareness as a desirable personal attribute is certainly not newer than the Socratic injunction, "Know thyself"; but what is new in our time is the fact that thoughtful social scientists and hardheaded businessmen are coming to see that self-awareness or self-understanding is directly related to an individual's capacity to do creative work with other people. Businessmen are beginning to think not only of the logics of business but also of what Pareto described as the nonlogics or the sentiments of people. They are beginning to see that their own behavior is a factor which influences the behavior of others, and that they are personally involved in more roles than one in every situation in which they play a part.

Let me illustrate from my own personal experience:

For a short time, some years ago, I engaged in the general practice of law. Later I became employed as a lawyer by an insurance company. As a lawyer my clients' problems were not mine; and no matter how hard I tried to solve them, I stood outside of the situation and was not involved in it. But when later I took an administrative position, I found that this detachment was no longer possible, even if I wanted it. I was personally involved in every important decision, and my behavior was affecting others. The shock of being forced to examine my own behavior was by no means small. What I needed to do, however, was no less than what all successful administrators are doing daily in every business.

In addition to self-awareness there is the need for understanding others. What we are learning today is not just that it is a "good thing to see the other fellow's point of view," but also what it is that often makes it difficult to do so. We are learning that we cannot really understand another if we agree with him, nor can we understand him if we disagree! When we feel either love or hate, we lose our power to see the world as others see it. We blur our own perceptions, and we cut off the normal flow of words which help us see into another's mind.

Gateways to Communication

This conclusion has tremendous significance. If understanding the needs and desires of others is an essential for collective creative effort, it means that we can no longer be quick to evaluate people or their opinions as either good or bad. During the understanding process at least, we must throw our ethical judgments out the window.

Carl R. Rogers and F. J. Roethlisberger made this same point when in essence they said that the great barrier to communication is our tendency to evaluate, to approve or disapprove the statements that other people make.³ For example:

If you say to me, "I prefer Englishmen to the French," there is almost an overwhelming urge for me to say either "So do I" or "No, I think they are stuffy." We may then talk for hours without a meeting of the minds. If, on the other hand, I want to find out whether we really agree or disagree about this matter, if I want to listen intelligently and to understand what you mean, thus opening the gateway to communication, then I must restrain my natural inclination to presume what you mean and instead make an effort to draw you out. I might ask something like, "Do you mean Englishmen are more to be admired?" You may reply, "Yes, they are really facing up to their economic problems better than the French." And if I continue in that way, rephrasing your comments in question form to test out what you are *trying* to tell me, there is a much better chance that we can have a fruitful discussion.

This brief explanation of a gateway to understanding, of receiving communications, of listening, may sound extremely obvious and somewhat simple. We spend most of our time learn-

ing to express ourselves, which is difficult enough but still easier than listening. Indeed, it is fair to say that listening is one of the most difficult things in the world to do. When someone charges into your office and criticizes some action that you have taken, it is not easy to find out what is really on his mind when your first impulse is to tell him to "go to hell." Or take the case where somebody asks you for your advice because he cannot make up his mind about a personal problem; most of us are inclined to comply with such a request without knowing what the real problem is, or without realizing that the decision will be sound only if it is made by the troubled person himself.

It takes real insight to be able to express in words what someone else is trying to tell us. It also takes great effort and even courage. If we put ourselves in someone else's position, if we try to express adequately his point of view, we may find that our own views become changed in the process. Professor Rogers says, "The risk of being changed is one of the most frightening prospects many of us can face."⁴

There are, of course, many other ways of securing understanding; some of them have been outlined by Stuart Chase in his recent popularization of social science, *Roads to Agreement*.⁵ One is particularly worth mentioning:

This way is modeled on the long-established custom of the Quaker business meeting. Quakers as a class are great individualists, but in handling the business affairs of their churches they act only with unanimity. They have no formal voting, no sense of a majority imposing its will on a reluctant minority. If a problem cannot be settled by unanimous agreement, they invoke periods of silence or put over the question until some future meeting. Some solution is usually forthcoming.

This rule of unanimity, it seems, is now being practiced by boards of directors and executive committees in businesses throughout the land. What a far cry this is from deciding what is the greatest good for the greatest number by a mechanical counting of hands! Where difference is accepted, it is possible also to accept the notion that a minority may be right.

Integration versus Compromise

The concept of integration as opposed to compromise is also achieving a wider recognition.

³ Carl R. Rogers and F. J. Roethlisberger, "Barriers and Gateways to Communication," *HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW*, July-August 1952, p. 46.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

⁵ New York, Harper & Brothers, 1951, p. 45 ff.

Integration may be called the means of solving a conflict of opinion in such a way that both sides prevail. The idea behind it is that the basic interests underlying many disputes are not inconsistent. For example:

If two people in an office want to use the same desk, it may appear at first that a major conflict is in the making, which can be solved only if one or the other wins the decision. On investigation, however, it may appear that one of the persons wants the desk in order to have better light, whereas the other wants it in order to be near some friend. If these facts come out, it will be apparent that neither wants the desk as such and that it may well be possible to satisfy the basic interests of both.

In order to achieve integrations, says Miss Follett, we should "never, if possible, allow an either/or situation to be created. . . . There are almost always more than two alternatives in a situation and our job is to analyze the situation carefully enough for as many as possible to appear. A yes-or-no question is in itself a prejudgment."⁶

May there not be some relationship between these methods of reaching understanding and the spirit which is not too sure that it is right? Is there not some connection between these techniques of agreement and our capacity for collective creativeness? Can it not be said that in a creative society we must have both conflict and agreement?

Rights and Obligations

A third standard of a creative society, and an essential ingredient in our workaday world, has been foreshadowed by our discussion of difference and of understanding. It is the belief that human relationships are two-way matters and that rights are matched by obligations.

The "Double Plus"

Karl Marx predicted that in Western society it was inevitable that the rich would become richer and the poor would become poorer. This increasing division between the classes would, as he saw it, accelerate class warfare and the revolution. If our society had indeed been basically competitive and acquisitive, instead of creative and cooperative, Marx may well have

been proved right. But the fact is that today, through our collective creativeness, the poor have become richer. Our society has been able to create wealth at a vastly greater rate than it has increased its population.

By and large, we have been able to maintain the viewpoint that our economic and political problem is not so much to redistribute the wealth that exists as to create more wealth for all. As the eminent economist, Kenneth Boulding, has written, "Economic life is not a 'zero-sum' poker game in which a fixed volume of wealth is circulated among the players, but a 'positive-sum' enterprise in which the accumulation of each person represents something he brings to the 'pot' rather than something he takes out."⁷ In other words, we are engaged in a creative task of producing more and better things. We recognize that we share as we contribute, that no society can long give something for nothing (to the poor *or* the rich), and that we cannot do great work unless *everyone* shares both in the work and in its results.

This concept has been called by many names. Mutuality is one; give-and-take is another. Professor Charles I. Gragg of the Harvard Business School calls it the "double plus." As he sees it, business transactions and other relationships can be described in one of three ways:

(1) There is first the kind of a transaction in which the plus is all on my side, leaving a big minus for you. If I take all the profit, however, through my power or my cleverness, then I have really lost the bargain, because you will come to distrust me and will refuse to do business with me for long.

(2) The reverse situation is equally disastrous. If I, through an excess of altruism or with misguided notions of humanity, permit you to take the entire profit, with nothing for myself, I put you in the unhappy role of being a recipient of my charity; moreover, I leave myself unable to do further business with anyone.

(3) But there is still another and more satisfactory form. Only if you profit moderately and I profit moderately, only if there is a plus for you and a plus for me — a double plus — can we continue to deal with one another steadily and with confidence.

In our business lives we are beginning to see that by consciously fashioning our relationships with our employees, with our suppliers, with our

⁶ *Dynamic Administration — The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett* (New York, Harper & Brothers, 1940), pp. 219, 220.

⁷ "Religious Foundations of Economic Progress," *HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW*, May-June 1952, p. 36.

customers — and, indeed, even with our competitors — we are not making suspicious and careful deals so much as common-sense arrangements that are carried on in this spirit of mutual give-and-take. That does not mean anything petty like back-scratching; every service and every kindness is not to be immediately returned, nor is every service to be performed in the hope of return. The correct attitude, rather, is a healthy respect for the well-being and personal integrity of the other fellow.

Profit to All Parties

What does all this imply? Only in an atmosphere of profit (in the broad sense) to all parties can we meet the creative objectives that our society sets. If, in times past, we erred on the side of taking too much for ourselves, it is equally essential that we do not err in the future on the side of trying to do too much for others. A too-literal application of the Sermon on the Mount — the turn of the cheek — does small damage to us but great damage to him who strikes the blow.

Why is it, otherwise, that the problem of providing for the aged worker has once more raised its head, when we thought a few years ago that we had safely tucked it away with compulsory retirement and pensioning at age 65? From the point of view of sympathy for the aged and of convenience in administering our business enterprises, the practice is as desirable today as it was 15 years ago. We have discovered, however, that many individual men who retire are hurt because they lose their sense of being creative, of being useful members of society. Moreover, when we contemplate that 11% of our population will be over 65 in another 20 years, we begin to realize that the real economic cost of compulsory retirement is not the money that goes into pensions but the lost productivity of these older people.

It seems that people, individually and in groups, must continue to be creative; if they are not, the individual or society, or both, will suffer. If we do not intend to keep people over 65 in business, some other way must be found to permit them to continue active membership in the world's work.

The same kind of thinking underlies our concern for other noncontributors to society. Society has been doing an increasingly successful job of minimizing sickness of almost all kinds, not so

much out of solicitude for the feelings of persons who are ill as out of its own self-interest in having the benefit of their contribution. Programs undertaken with this motive quickly earn common respect, for the galling part of illness to the sufferer is the necessity of having to depend on others, of not being able to contribute his share.

We are concerned for similar reasons about the criminal and the indolent. It is true that we have not as yet learned enough to be confident of our ability to rehabilitate these people. But we have at least learned that it is no answer to judge them or to punish them; our first task is to understand them. We consider them "cured" only when they join the majority of their fellows, contributing commensurately to what they receive.

Why do businessmen fight against the welfare state? Are businessmen actually heartless and callous? Don't they recognize that the sick and the poor need the aid of the rest who are well and able? Of course they do. But their experience says to them that doctors do not give pills to everyone because a few are sick; that when a man is given something for which he has not worked, he feels degraded; that a man who is well and able wants to earn what he receives.

Businessmen, who have learned from experience that paternalism has failed, hope that government will learn from their mistakes. Businessmen have good reason for believing that government will not really serve the poor and sick until it stops regarding them as "little people" and undertakes instead the harder job of giving them an honest chance to do useful and creative work.

Faith in Men's Growth

The fourth and last condition of maintaining and strengthening a creative society, the force that provides direction and control, is a clear faith in the growth and development of men. The machine age poses a great challenge to our willingness to demonstrate this faith. All of the new wealth we can produce with modern technology is of little avail if in the process men are reduced to the levels of the machines they tend. But fortunately we are not confronted with a Hobson's choice between wealth and men. We have found that the more we are able to train

and develop men as individuals, leaving repetitive work to machines, the greater satisfactions they obtain and the more productive (in a material sense) they become.

Take a business with a large content of routine clerical work, e.g., life insurance. In this business we stand on the threshold of a new era in adapting electronics to office workers' problems. When any business reaches this point, to be sure, management is bound to face the problem of securing the cooperation of people who may prefer things as they are. It may even have to face a problem of technological unemployment. But however real and thorny these difficulties are, they are insignificant compared to the human values that are gained. Instead of a business in which, say, 75% of the employees are engaged in routine tasks, the modern machine makes it possible for 75% to be engaged in tasks requiring skill and judgment. The machine eliminates human toil; but, much more important, it also provides opportunities for men to do only those tasks men alone can do.

New Concept of Organization

The development of the machine economy has numerous important implications for management. For one thing, it is fast bringing about a new concept of business organization. No longer can the boss know all the details and the intricacies of the operation he supervises. He is being forced more and more to rely on his subordinates, to consult with them, to be guided by their joint conclusions — in short, to permit them to share and to grow in breadth of vision.

This in turn means, of course, a gradual abandonment of authoritarian principles. Administrators have begun to conceive of their role not as manipulators of labor but as coordinators of functions. Re-examining themselves and their jobs, they have discovered that they have no special claim to superior wisdom, no vested authority over the work and lives of others. They have found, rather, that they have a function to perform: to plan ahead, to coordinate the others, to secure their interest and cooperation.

Society will not, as a result, tend to become classless in any Marxian sense. Far from it. We may reasonably anticipate, however, that members of future "elites" will come to occupy positions of status and power less because of

wealth, position, or birth and more because of the kind of contributions they make or because of the kind of functions they fulfill. Key positions will tend more and more to be occupied by those who are best able to conceive new ideas and the application of old ones, who are best able to communicate ideas and events, and who are best able to pull together people and things to achieve creative ends. Today's inheritance tax and management's increased interest in personnel development are fast speeding this process along.

Administrators as Teachers

In an important sense the role of the administrator seems destined to become more and more that of the instructor — the kind of teacher who understands his pupils, accepts their differences, commands their respect, and inspires them to creative work of every kind. In such a role, administrators will have less of a problem of discipline to the degree that they are able to develop an environment for creative experience and to lead their students (their workers) to savor the satisfying taste of personal accomplishment. In so doing they will have gone far to eliminate the distinction between "schooling" and "education" which Mark Twain quite properly made when he quipped, "I have never let my schooling interfere with my education."

In their new role as teachers, administrators are learning that attitudes and viewpoints which affect behavior can frequently be communicated effectively only if they are reduced to concrete terms. In their efforts at training and development, particularly, they are recognizing the need to start from real case situations. Witness the growing attention to discussions of actual business problems rather than the oft-repeated clichés on general principles of management.

Abstract ideas, however, are not to be discarded simply because they so often fail to influence behavior. Indeed, as the mark of civilized men they are necessary tools of communication which are quite adequate *if* both writer and reader start from the same premises. They are easily accepted, in other words, if they seem meaningful in relation to one's own experience. Aneurin Bevan's autobiography affords an example of this:

Bevan's life as a young Welsh miner was filled with frustrations. Then he read Karl Marx. This experience "had all the impact of divine revelation.

Everything fell in place. The dark places were lighted up and the difficult ways made easy." ⁸ Marx is most abstract, but nevertheless his words have had a great effect on people whose experience has led them to feel like chained and exploited men.

The moral of this fact has not been lost on businessmen and statesmen, who know that the only real and lasting bulwark against Marxism is in the experience of the large body of our workers and our citizens. If that experience is basically creative and satisfying — and it is management's task to see that it is so — the stultifying conformities of the Socialist state will always be bitter to their taste.

But businessmen and statesmen, while often seeing what is the best *defense* against Marxism, have not been so quick to see what needs to be done in a *positive* way. Like Marxians, we too must have an appropriate body of abstract ideas — ideas that can constitute a simple article of faith but are also capable of profound extension, ideas that are consistent with experience but are also adaptable to new insights and new truths.

Perhaps this discussion will stimulate others to work out such ideas — each in his own way, as a part of our individual differences, but all toward the same goal, in the spirit of mutuality. What I have written can be no more than a preface.

Conclusion

The problems of production, distribution, and finance are usually foreign to a worker's experience and interests. It is therefore just as silly for top management to hope that workers will be anxious to understand the problems of the business as it would be to fear that they are interested in gaining control of the business. What workers do appear to want is a chance to increase their usefulness and creativeness, a chance to develop their full potential as individuals within the scope of their environment

⁸ *In Place of Fear* (New York, Simon and Schuster, 1952), p. 19.

and experience. It has become part of management's function to see not only that they have that chance but that the philosophy behind it is made articulate.

But the creative society is based on more than the relationship between management and workers, indispensable though that is in our industrial age. It depends on close relationships between all fields of human endeavor. Business is not "just business." The Chinese wall between business and the home, the community, the school, and the church has long since been stormed. Business is all people, places, and things; it is physics, economics, politics, sociology, psychology, philosophy, ethics, and aesthetics.

In the same broad sense, business is also religion. One of the recurring themes in most religions is that God is viewed as the Creator and that creativeness is one of His essential attributes. Another recurring theme is that man's spirit, his conscious "self," his unique ability to transcend his material and animal limitations, is the essence of God in man. To suggest that creativeness may be a basic attribute of men in society is thus merely to relate these two ageless insights.

Moreover, it seems that a religious sense of wonder, humility, and faith helps us to see the vision of a boundless future built by the inherent capacities of men from all walks of life and of all races, creeds, natures, and backgrounds. It is a vision of cooperation, togetherness, and sharing the great adventure. It is a vision of independence and courage that explores the far reaches of the universe and probes deep into the essence of what we call man. It is, in short, a vision of a changing, growing, and infinitely exciting world which depends for its existence on the spirit that is not too sure it is right, on a deep-seated desire to open our minds and our hearts to the lives of others, on the practical sense of give-and-take, on our faith in the growth and development of ourselves and our fellow men.

Copyright © Harvard Business Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This content is intended for individual research use only, subject to the following:

Unless permission is expressly granted in a separate license, this content may NOT be used for classroom or teaching use, which includes teaching materials, electronic reserves, course packs or persistent linking from syllabi. Please consult your institution's librarian about the nature of relevant licenses held by your institution and the restrictions that may or may not apply.

Unless permission is expressly granted in a separate license, this content may NOT be used in corporate training and/or as corporate learning materials. For corporate users, please consult the specific terms of your company's license(s) for complete information and restrictions.

For more information and teaching resources from Harvard Business Publishing including Harvard Business School Cases, eLearning products, and business simulations please visit hbsp.harvard.edu.