

**Tattva**  
JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY

## EDUCATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Tsukasa Fujinuma\*

### Abstract

*Human co-operation is composed of forces as given objective causal factors and they are integrated by organization, which is oriented by subjectivity. In the contemporary society, the degree of civilization is in large part dependent on the ability of organization. This situation is called "The Age of Organization". We are now faced with the crisis of losing harmonic relations between organization and its forces/environment. Today, the task of management theories and management practices is to create harmonic relations between these two. To achieve Peace, we must attain truthful beauty between organization and its forces/environment. This is the function of "management as Art". We would like to call it "Environmental Management," explained under three headings: (1) Organization and the natural environment, (2) Organization and the human environment, (3) Organization and the social environment.*

### 1. Introduction

Our contemporary civilization is faced with the crisis of losing harmonic relations between Nature and Artificiality. We are forced to question conventional directionality of this civilization, and to hope to switch. Alfred N. Whitehead (1861-1947) says,

---

\* Dr. Tsukasa Fujinuma is Professor of Aomori Public College, Goushizawa, Aomori, Japan, E-mail: fujinuma@bb.nebuta.ac.jp

in the outstanding shifts from one time to another, there are two factors acting at anytime. It is "Senseless agencies" and "Persuasive agencies". "Senseless agencies" are "driving their respective civilizations away from inherited modes of order" (AI, 5). "Persuasive agencies" are "articulated beliefs" or "force of consciously formulated ideas". This furthers innovation of respective age (AI, 6). "In every age of well-marked transition there is the pattern of habitual dumb practice and emotion which is passing, and there is oncoming of a new complex of habit" (AI, 7).

In the contemporary society at the turning point of civilization, we can regard "Senseless agencies" as the natural environmental destruction, terrorism, global capitalism and recent financial crises. In contrast, what will be "Persuasive agencies"? We may be haunted by uneasiness because we cannot find such "Persuasive agencies". Standing at a turning point, we should question conventional customs and may create by combination a new custom. In this paper, we will propose "Persuasive agencies" called "Philosophy of Sustainability" as one directionality to further innovation of the times. For concrete development, we will elaborate a plan in "Environmental Management" from the viewpoint of business administration.

Within this paper, we will refer to Chester I. Barnard (1886-1961). Barnard is noted as the founder of modern organization theory in the field of business administration. He was influenced by Whitehead at Harvard and wrote his famous book *The Functions of the Executive* (1938) utilizing Whitehead's philosophy. Through this paper, we will examine how "Environmental Management" based on Barnardian theory contributes to the realization of "a civilized society" that Whitehead characterizes as holding the five qualities of Truth, Beauty, Adventure, Art, and Peace.

## 2. The origin of artificiality and its organized development

Nature, societies and human beings are a system. All systems are living while being lived by the others. A system is composed of other systems as subsystems. Natural system contains social and individual systems. Social and individual systems are similar to it, too. Each system interplays among other systems closely. These subsystems are the circumstance / environment of the system. A system creates new self, while exceeds subsystems as the circumstance / environment. "There is a freedom lying beyond circumstance" (AI 67). "The essence of freedom is the practicability of purpose" (AI 66). In other words there can be a freedom in each system. A system pursues its self-purpose beyond the circumstance / environment. This is a freedom of system. Herein lies the novelty of a system.

In human society, freedom has been realized as to artificialize the circumstance / environment ("artificialization of the circumstance / environment"). This is a basic characteristic of civilization. Through time, human society raises the degree of "artificialization of the circumstance / environment".

"Artificialization of the circumstance / environment" is accomplished by an individual and human cooperation. These were named "powers" by Barnard. According to Barnardian thoughts, in our social world various forces (natural, social and human) flow in whirls. They do continuously interact, and often conflict with or oppose each other (Barnard, 1986, 30). Powers are going to utilize, direct, balance and harmonize these forces to realize its own purpose. The characters of powers are (1) to be provoked by forces / environment (givenness), (2) to sublimate them into some positive factor, (3) to become a subject. This is dependent on the core thought of Whitehead's philosophy. As individual or human cooperation, human being is expected to exert "human art" (= "ability of organizing forces") that is rather to supplement or (re)adjust them than to conflict with or oppose each other. This is the inescapable task of humankind.

The degree of civilization depends on the degree of "human art" that is "ability of organizing forces" (Barnard, 1986, 35). As the degree of "ability of organizing forces", i.e. the degree of "artificialization of the circumstance / environment", increases, human being break away from natural environments. We consider the history of human society to be a process of the expansion of the degree of "artificialization of the circumstance / environment". Here is a basic problem of freedom in our contemporary civilization. This has been achieved through expansion / development of the human cooperation. By expansion of such Artificiality, the state of nature will suffer a large-scale change, too. It is because natural system contains Artificiality of human beings and society. Here is found the meaning of civilization of "management as Art" of harmonizing artificiality with nature.

### 3. The view of Barnard theory - mainly on a human cooperation –

The contemporary society is characterized as "The Age of Organization". The reason is because this social world is remarkably characterized by the ability of art of human cooperation. Business administration sets human cooperation such as the company into the core of the study. It has contributed to development of the contemporary society as "The Age of Organization" mainly led by a company. Therefore, in the following, this paper discusses human cooperation.

Barnard conceptualizes various human cooperations as "cooperative system". A cooperative system is a complex of natural, social and human forces, and organization. He treats a cooperative system from two sides. One side is "being lived", it is provoked by natural, social and human forces / environment. The other side is "living", in spite of being lived by these environments, a cooperative system exceeds them, and creates new self, i.e. "organization". Organization is oriented by subjectivity, and selectively derives "management resources" from its forces / environment.

In other words, organization prehends its forces / environment. A cooperative system is a process becoming a creatively new self.



Figure 1 Cooperative system

Potentially, there are the urges from each forces / environment in a cooperative system. Barnard calls such urge "moral code". The moral code is a meaning of the force to really prescribe the subject. In other words, potentially, there are natural, social and human (private) moral codes in a cooperative system. For such moral codes, how does the organization as the subject respond to them? By a process of the response, a moral code peculiar to the organization (organization code) is generated. Potentially, the cooperative system is a complex moral system containing various moral codes.

A problem of the responsibility in the human cooperation occurs here. Potentially, there are various codes in cooperation. The organization needs subjective response ability to them. It means "responsibility" to the urges. Therefore, the cooperative system potentially involves various responsibilities such as natural, social, human and organizational responsibility.

Human societies took a long time, and, through expansion / development of the human cooperation, each have exceeded the circumstance / forces, and have raised the practicability of purpose (the degree of freedom). The spreading cooperative system has acquired a particular freedom to respond to the organization code subjectively beyond a simple "instinctive response" to the circumstance / environment. In addition, the degree of freedom of many individuals rose with it, too. However, the increase of the degree of freedom leads to the complexity of morality and of the load on the performance of responsibility.

Therefore there is the danger that conflict among nature, society, individual and organization enlarges. The human being must undertake persistent dilemma of such a human cooperation.

A cooperative system is the process that living while being lived by various forces / environments. Therefore it is necessary to notice the role of "human art" i.e. "management as Art" that harmonizes nature, society, individual and organization. The core of "management as Art" includes "Creation of a new morality" that harmonizes various moral codes. But the problem is directionality and contents of the new morality (Barnard, 1968, 284). Barnard proposes "the height of moral aspirations" and "the breadth of moral foundations", as the condition. The success of "the creation of new morality" depends on the harmony of these two conditions.

The height of moral aspirations is "objective height". "When these purposes are high and the wills of many men of many generations are bound together they (organization) live boundlessly" (Barnard, 1968, 284). In the organization, it is necessary to generate its own self, integrating pluralistic moral codes for the higher purpose. This is "Vertically Closing".

However, the organization needs a common base to become able to coexist without causing conflict among various moral codes. It is "the breadth of moral foundations". Barnard captured this problem as a problem of "the security of the tolerance". The moral foundation which makes a base of the cooperation is opening. "It comes from and may expand to all the world; it is deeply rooted in the past, it faces toward the endless future" (Barnard, 1968, 284). The spread of the moral foundations has not only been spatial, but temporal. Therefore if an organization continues successfully, the conditions are as follows. (1) The organization needs the simultaneous harmony with the many situations (nature, societies and human). (2) The organization needs the diachronic harmony with the many situations (nature, societies and human). When the organization expands the breadth of moral foundations of the organization simultaneously and diachronically, the breadth is over the times across the border, the organization will continue and develop. This is "Horizontally Opening".

"The height of moral aspirations" and "the breadth of moral foundations" are two opportunities when an organization unifies forces / environment. The degree of civilization is dependent on the degree of "management as Art" realizing the practicability of purpose and harmony with various forces / environment through these two opportunities.

## 4. A characteristic of human cooperation in modern civilization

The cooperative system supporting modern civilization is a system of complicated morality. There potentially are various meanings of "natural", "social", "human" and "organization". The expansion / the development of the cooperation brought superiority of "meaning of the organization" to various meanings. The cooperative system exceeds the circumstance / environment (natural, social and human) and adds to the degree of freedom of the organization.

Mainly a cooperative system characterizing our society is a large-scale economic cooperative system (a profit organization such as a company). Understanding this economic cooperative system, management practice and business administration violated the "Fallacy of Misplaced Concreteness". It emphasizes "Meaning of the organization" rather than various meanings in an economic cooperative system. This "meaning of the organization" abstracted an economic value such as "maximization of economic profit" and "the organization as going concern" from a cooperative system. George E. Mayo (1880-1949) called modern management practice and business administration that violated the "Fallacy of Misplaced Concreteness" "Intelligent management" (Mayo, 1945). The core of Mayo's criticism is that Intelligent management pays attention to "meaning of the organization", from this viewpoint, it prehends the circumstance / environment as "management resource". This practice and theory regards its circumstance / environment as the objective means.

An organization has two kinds of composition "formal organization" and "informal organization". The famous definition of formal organization is "a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons" (Barnard, 1986, 73). The elements of an organization are (1) common purpose, (2) communication, and (3) willingness to serve. On the other hand, the element of an informal organization is continuous communication, and common sense which lies at the root of the informal organization. Barnard classifies "informal organization" as two kinds of "primary informal organization" and "secondary informal organization". The former means the interaction of the broad people, such as "society" and "community", which is unrelated to specific human cooperation. The latter is the interaction of people attending the formation of specific formal organization.

It promoted hierarchically organizing of formal organization through subdivision / specialization aiming at promotion of effectiveness of the work. Barnard says that

this development brings about "the segmentation of informal organization", furthermore "a crisis of division / collapse of the informal organization" (Barnard, 1948, 146-147).

Barnard submits that "The unity of the informal organization of our society tends to break down through the development of innumerable secondary informal organizations with customs and languages of their own" (Barnard, 1948, 148). The development of high specialization / hierarchical organization (bureaucracy) of the specific formal organization creates a lot of unit formal organizations and secondary informal organization, and brings about "a crisis of the division / collapse", furthermore "subdivision of primary informal organization".

Barnard points out the rise of the large-scale economic cooperative system (such as companies) as the root of "the decline of society". "Economic activities until recent times were almost entirely personal and local, and were largely governed by local custom" (Barnard, 1986, 41). This "custom of the particular local" is "the culture of the primary informal organization". But the large-scale cooperative system is "economic cooperation on so great a scale that it constitutes itself an organized though obscure Authority comparable to State and Church of previous centuries" (Barnard, 1986, 41). "In these a large part of the activities of individuals occurs. They are the foci of much of their major interest" (Barnard, 1948, 147). A culture prescribes the individual or social behaviors. In other words Barnard's problem with the submission of above-mentioned means that the shifts from "the culture of the primary informal organization" to "the culture of the secondary informal organization", furthermore "the subsumption of an individual at the specific organization". In other words it is "superiority of the morality of the organization". With expansion / development of the cooperation on a large scale, there are the two characteristics. The first, participating people did not have to know the general purpose of the organization. They focus on each purpose of the unit formal organizations. As a result, it becomes difficult to find "objective height". The second, "the moral foundations of the organization" is dwarfed. As a result, potentially various meanings in cooperation are undervalued. "Meaning of the organization" has been prioritized and eroded by a meaning of the economy.

Roughly speaking, Barnard's problem submission has two characteristics. The first is the "subdivision of primary informal organization", furthermore "crisis of the division / collapse of primary informal organization" i.e. "dismantling / transformation of traditional social relations". The second is "enclosing the individual within the specific organization". This is the situation that is remarkable in the 20th century.

However, the situation is more serious today. It originates in the formation of "global market". A market is a cooperative system in a Barnardian theory, too. If so, a market accompanies the secondary informal organization, too. The global market accompanies the secondary huge informal organization, and the primary informal organizations of various levels have been enclosed by the secondary huge informal organization. Therefore, the primary informal organization's culture of various levels has been enclosed by the secondary huge informal organization's culture. A global market's culture forces each primary informal organization's culture of various levels to prioritize the economic value. It falls on the problem submitted by John Cobb related to Sustainable Community.

## 5. The design of "Environmental Management"

With the expansion / development of cooperation, "superiority of the morality of the organization" forces the organization to give priority to the request of the organization code (responsibility for the effectiveness of the organization or the organization continuation) rather than the urges of various codes of others (natural, social and human responsibility). We would like to call the situation as "Intolerance of organization". Here is the origin of the problems of contemporary business administration. They are elicited as, (1) the Earth's environmental problem, (2) the problem of the culture multiverse and (3) the problem of humanity (Murata, 1995).

"Intolerance of the organization" is "priority of meaning of the organization" or "the exclusion of various meanings". Overcoming this problem, how does a organization actualize to harmonize "meaning of organization" with each various meanings. In principle, contemporary business administration will need to respond to the problem of tolerance.

The harmonic relations between organization and the circumstance / environment need to achieve the equilibrium of forces. This "equilibrium" means that it is not only static but dynamic, and is not only quantitative but qualitative / value (Murata, 1984, 62-62). It is necessary to realize balance i.e. tolerance between potentially various urge in cooperative system to overcome disproportion (intolerance). "Environmental Management" is requested here. The contents are as follows: To create harmonic and sustainable relations between: (i) Organization and the natural environment; (ii) Organization and the social environment; and (iii) Organization and the human environment. Barnard propounds "Creative Management" to respond to this problem.

In the following, I would like to review "Creative Management", while being conscious of correspondence with Whitehead's philosophy. Securing tolerance, a manager is



required to achieve "Creation of a new morality" that harmonizes organization code with potentially various moral codes (urges). This is the core of "management as Art". "Creative Management as Art" aims to harmonize "meaning of organization" with meaning of natural, social and human. "Harmonizing Artificiality with Nature" is "Truthful Beauty". It is the core that Adventure aims at "creation of a new morality" that sets tragedy in the background. Ahead of tragedy of the disharmony of potentially various forces, how do we aim at "the reconciliation of freedom with the compulsion of the truth" (Whitehead, 1967, 68)? Therefore "The innovation of ability of organizing forces" is requested. Here is the core of Peace. Peace does not mean to attain "meaning of organization" but to harmonize organization with natural, social and human environment. We would like to propound that "Creative Management" has the potential to overcome many problems of our contemporary civilization, and show a directionality of "Environmental Management".

## 6. Conclusion

Human society has raised the degree of freedom through expansion / development of human cooperation. As a result, "meaning of the organization" is enlarged. However, understanding this cooperative system, management practice and business administration violated "Fallacy of Misplaced Concreteness". It emphasizes "Meaning of the organization" rather than potentially various meanings in a cooperative system. This "meaning of the organization" abstracted an economic value from a cooperative system. This means that Nature, society and human being are thoroughly objectified, and are economically evaluated by the organization. This emphasis of "meaning of organization" has been realized as "a tear of the harmony" between Nature and Artificiality. It brings on many problems of our contemporary civilization such as the Earth's environmental problem, the problem of the culture multiverse, or the problem of humanity. Such numerous problems results in the problem of "intolerance of the organization". When this occurs, it is bringing "dismantling / transformation of Community".

Two opportunities are obtained when "the height of moral aspirations" and "the breadth of moral foundations" unify various forces that a cooperative system contains. However, in our contemporary civilization, "Vertically Closing" and "Horizontally Opening" have been dwarfed with expansion / development of the cooperation.

How can we realize "harmony of various meaning" in cooperation? Barnard theorized this solution in a form called "Creative Management" from the viewpoint of "all systems are living while being lived by the others", which will be able to

realize "creation of a new morality". Through this, it is able to attain the richness of organization while retaining the richness of nature, society and human being. It may be necessary for us to develop this idea as "Environmental Management". A trial of this is a future endeavor.

## References

01. Barnard, Chester I., 'Persistent Dilemmas of Social Progress', in *Philosophy for Managers: Selected Papers of Chester I. Barnard*, edited by Wolf, W.B. & Iino, H., Bunshindo, 1986.
02. Barnard, Chester I., 'Notes on Some Obscure Aspects of Human Relations', in *Philosophy for Managers: Selected Papers of Chester I. Barnard*, edited by Wolf, W.B. & Iino, H., Bunshindo, 1986.
03. Barnard, Chester I., *The Functions of the Executive*, Harvard University Press, 1968.
04. Barnard, Chester I., 'On Planning for World Government', in *Organization and Management: Selected Papers*, Harvard University Press, 1948.
05. Mayo, George E., *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization: with an Appendix on The Political Problem* Routledge & Kegan Paul LTD, 1945.
06. Murata, Haruo, *Kanri no Tetsugaku* (meaning which *Philosophy of Management*), Bunshindo, 1984.
07. Murata, Haruo, 'The Logic of Organism: the Development of Barnardian theory', in *Leading Figures in the Discipline of Management: Nicklisch, Barnard, Marx*, edited by The Society for the History of Management Theories, Bunshindo, 1995.
08. Whitehead, Alfred N., *Adventures of Ideas*, The Free Press, 1967.