

## HISTORICAL AND THEORETICAL TRADITIONS OF KNOWLEDGE IN MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

**Assoc. Prof. Mark Goncharenko**<sup>1</sup>

**Assoc. Prof. Elena Rogotneva**<sup>1</sup>

**Senior Teacher Olga Demidova**<sup>1</sup>

**Student Elina Michalzhova**<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tomsk Polytechnic University, **Russia**

### ABSTRACT

Any management model used for achieving goals of an organization is conditioned by socioeconomic, ideological and scientific paradigms. These paradigms are relevant at a certain historical moment, but it doesn't mean that they didn't exist earlier. On the contrary, they were known and used in earlier times. The authors' main aim is to reveal and determine the regularity, which makes it possible to use a certain management model at a given moment of the historical development as the most suitable one. Besides, the authors aimed to determine, how the knowledge of the inner nature of people's relations influenced the development of management systems. To achieve this aim it is necessary to limit this research by the fields studied, as well as by the time periods of the management models. The authors compare the methods used to rule ancient slaves in Rome Empire with the methods of management in contemporary, modern management systems. The book 'How to Manage Your Slaves. Marcus Sidonius Falx' by Jerry Toner [1] serves as a starting point of the research. The authors claim that even the slavery as a social model of management disappeared long time ago, the elements of the ancient slavery management system can be found even in modern management systems. It can especially be found in the subordination "a manager-a subordinated".

**Keywords:** management, social status, social role, management models, socio-cultural discourse.

### INTRODUCTION

Management models are based on knowledge from different fields of science, this assists both to the development of the cognitive process and to the formation of scientific paradigms, actual for the current historical period. The role and significance of this knowledge are shown from the point of view of philosophy and history of science. The present research states that knowledge cannot be divided by those conventional boundaries that limit humanitarian, scientific and technical spheres. The main purpose of this classification is, first of all, maximum detalization of the subject under study. In this case it is possible to structure different aspects of one and the same object under study. That is why; our statement about the interrelation of historical and theoretical traditions of knowledge is aimed to discover possible grounds of such an interrelation. Different management models used through the whole history of human society prove this statement. The interrelation of a management model and a relevant scientific

paradigm may seem strange. Though, correspondence of socio-economic models to scientific paradigms explains the rigidity of management models. Taking into the account *historicity* of the existence we suppose that the management model is determined at least by two levels. The first level (or *meta*-level) deals with goal setting, with the idea of achieving a certain goal (in our case the goal is to make someone to do the required action or thing). The second level deals with the achieving the desired result or it implies that an object under control will fulfill a certain algorithm of actions aimed at achieving of certain goals. So, the second level of this management model is conditioned by historically up-to-date forms of mythology, religion, science and so on.

### **HISTORICAL TRADITION VS THEORETICAL TRADITION**

It is well-known that the heliocentric model of the Universe (as one of the key elements of New-European scientific worldview) appeared in the 16<sup>th</sup> century during the period of active development of a new socio-economic lifestyle. Religious taboo could not prohibit applying new scientific ideas in real life. Experimental science helped to overcome natural economy and boosted the development of socio-economical relations in Europe. The key question here is what were the grounds for the formation of a new management model in the conditions of new socio-economic relations? Such an important factor of the European social life as urbanization had a direct relation to the new management model. While from the point of view of civilization development there was nothing new in urbanization. It was considered as a normal development of the next cultural and historical stage of civilization. But in fact, New-European urbanization differed from Roman Empire urbanization. From Marx's theory of socio-economic development, New Europe was bourgeois/capitalistic system, while Roman Empire was the slave system. [2] In our opinion it all is not so clear-cut. The theory of socio-economical formations suggests single-sided progressive division of the historical process, when all five formations are isolated from each other. In this theory the world's history is seen as disintegrated, not integral. In this case socio-economic systems do not only 'intercross', they just cannot do that according to the principal issues of this theory. Some alternative classifications of the world history admit the ideas of the Rome Imperia translation, but most of them, however, deny the unity of the historical Subject, i.e. of the Cognizer. While this Cognizer is the author of the world's history classification and the actor of the historical events forming different socio-economic formations. We can assume that the citizen of the Rome Empire is a person who had civil rights, which guaranteed him/her certain social status and at the same time were the instrument of his/her participation in the civil life. It is also true about the urban citizens of Early Modern period. "The essence of Alexandrinism and of our Romanticism is something which belongs to all urban men, without distinction. Romanticism marks the beginning of that which Goethe, with his wide vision, called world-literature – the literature of the leading world-city, against which a provincial literature, native to the soil, but negligible, struggles everywhere with difficulty to maintain itself. ... Consequently in all Civilizations the "modern" cities assume a more and more uniform type..." [3, p. 250] But, there are some moments distinguishing Rome Empire urbanization from New-European urbanization. Firstly, the number of towns is incomparably larger. New towns appeared as a consequence of new industrial relations. Secondly, juridically, there were no slave-owners in these new towns. Of course, the workers of the manufactures were to follow all the orders of the employers, but the later, juridically, had no such a complete power over the employees as the Rome slave-

owner had. This resulted in the appearance of “new” rules of relations between an employer and employees and of “new” (New-European) social agreement. It became necessary to keep the idea of the civil equality as well as the idea of the ownership for all parties of that social agreement. New-European urbanization passed amidst the formation of a new social hierarchy, which changed the rules of organization of the social life. Now these rules fully depended on new manufacturing relations, exactly, the right of ownership of means of production. “It is possible to understand the Greeks without mentioning their economic relations; the Romans, on the other hand, can only be understood through these.” [3, p. 27] Can we say that during New-European urbanization the Rome Civil Law, structuring some other kind of civil relations, was not demanded? The history tells “NO”. Henry Maine stated: “Law is stable; the societies we are speaking of are progressive. The greater or less happiness of a people depends on the degree of promptitude with which the gulf is narrowed.”

The Rome Civil Law was formed during the period of slave-owning system rules and followed this state of affairs. “The Roman Code was merely an enunciation in words of the existing customs of the Roman people.” [4] During the period of New-European urbanization there was no slave-owning relations. In that case, what happened to the civil law? How and why it can structure civil relations de-jure excepting the slave-owning relations? It is obvious that New-European civil law constructs relations of free civil citizens in new conditions, who have the rights of possession de-jure, without exception. In fact, this right brings us back to the civil relations structured by Rome Civil Law in slave-owning society. In other words, not all free Rome citizens had an opportunity to fulfill the juridical right in the real life. That fact equaled them to some extent with the slaves, juridically deprived of the rights of possession. Syllogistical trick here is hidden in the pseudo-paradox - you may have the right, but you are not supposed to use it. Juridical right and factual possession – these are modalities which do not always coincide. Moreover, they do not depend on the socio-economical model, as we have seen now. So, we can state that the scientific idea always constructs the reality according to the historically relevant way of modeling. According to Paul Feyerabend the scientific reality, which is used to order different elements of our world, is always determined by current trends [5]. What does it tell us about? It tells that the historically relevant way of modeling of the reality, and of social reality as well, is determined by expediency. For example, slaves in the Rome Empire could witness about the ownership rights of citizens, because it was considered expedient. The same can be said about the legal equality of citizens in the ownership in New European history (bourgeois relations from henceforth suppose the appearance of more and more new capitals, belonging to certain people). The expediency of the historical moment is determined by the efficiency and outcome, which influences the choice of this or that scientific thinking. Jerry Toner states that loyalty of a slave to the master determines the way of the history (the example is Tiberius ring above the night-stool). [1] How is this loyalty achieved? Does it influence the flow of history or the development of business in the company? Following J. Toner, we think – yes, it does.

The success of human management depends on many factors. Every owner decides for himself whether to take them into the account or not in every particular case. A slave-owner as well as a businessman will have nearly the same result at certain (let us assume, equal) loyalty level of an employee. Nowadays loyalty of an employee-free citizen is determined by social welfare, high salary, and labour-law compliance and so

on. The loyalty of a slave was determined by some rights that did not allow a slave to fall into depression because of his/her social status, that is to say – nearly the same rights. So, the concept “social status” determines the loyalty of an employee to the master. It is important to notice that this concept has different definitions and during different historical epochs included different elements. The concept ‘social status’ itself, appeared only in XIX century [4], but the inner notion determined by this concept has existed during the whole human history. Man as the Subject of history always had a certain status in the society, according to which he had a certain social rule. Assuming that any person is the subject of history, then he/she will always fulfill the process of social interaction, and the form of expression of this interaction will be a social role. We can see that a Rome slave as well as a New-European proletarian, being the Subject of history and taking part in the system of social interaction is a real actor of the actions influencing further social history development. Therefore, the distinction between the social action itself and its appreciation makes a social status important during the whole historical period. It is essential to point out one important feature here, determined by the phenomenon of social statuses of the history Subject. Status-role “distribution” of the history Subject is determined by his/her possibilities and responsibilities. That is why; loyalty to the master was and still is determined by the degree of social satisfaction of the history Subject which is given by the master to him. Despite different set of elements in the structure of the concept “social status” during different historical epochs, we can say that the employee’s loyalty to the master is important during any historical period, because the absence of it brings the latter serious problems in the sphere of further social interaction. Exactly, the absence of employee’s loyalty to the master, as well as that of the subjects to the “monarch” resulted, at least, in the social oppositions or in social catastrophes at maximum.

Actuality of the idea of the historical and theoretical tradition of knowledge in the context of different management systems is connected with the appearance of numerous methods and training courses during last decades, which provide, at the first sight, absolutely new knowledge about Man and His nature. But, the problem is that how far this *new* knowledge of the human nature is really *new*. In reality, these techniques and methods provide to the manager principles of management, well-known from the ancient times: “divide and rule”, “encourage and punish” and so on. The question arises: why does it happen? We think that the management system is based on the historical perception of the socio-cultural discourse.

## **CONCLUSION**

According to the historical tradition of knowledge, the knowledge is empirical, and the whole complex of knowledge, including theoretical models was being formed during a certain historical period and determined by the historical paradigm, that is by the tradition’s discourse. According to the theoretical tradition of knowledge, theoretical models are usually highly abstractive and represent some sample which was formed due to some penetration into the inner reality, and not due to the historical nature of scientific-social discourse. The contradiction between the theoretical and historical traditions looks absurd, as in this case we deny the actual connection between the nontemporal reality and contextuality of our own existence.

To clarify the idea, we will compare the abilities of the chemical analysis by Khun T. He gives the following example: “In the eighteenth century mixtures were not fully

distinguished from compounds by operational tests, and perhaps they could not have been. Even if chemists had looked for such tests, they would have sought criteria that made the solution a compound. The mixture-compound distinction was part of their paradigm – part of the way they viewed their whole field of research – and as such it was prior to any particular laboratory test, though not to the accumulated experience of chemistry as a whole.” [6, p.131-132]. From this it follows impossibility and out-of-history nature of a theoretical system as it is.

Returning to the initial thesis, we can state that the management model, based on the certain segment of knowledge is constructed by the theoretical system, which historical actuality is out of doubt at the current moment. Herewith, the theoretical system itself is historically determined by the tradition. This statement can be confirmed by Aristotel’s discourse about *the scientific* nature of management: the science of power does not have anything great or elevated because its key aim is to give an opportunity to the “master” to make the slave do his/her work . [7, I.2.1255b33-35]

## REFERENCES

- [1] Toner, Jerry. How to Manage Your Slaves. Marcus Sidonius Falx. Profile Books Ltd, 2014, 192 pp.
- [2] Marx, Karl. Pre-capitalist economic formations. New York: International Publishers, 1977, 153 pp.
- [3] Spengler, Oswald. The Decline of the West. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1926, 560 pp.
- [4] Maine, Henry. Ancient Law, Its Connection with the Early History of Society, and Its Relation to Modern Ideas (1 ed.). London: John Murray, 1861. URL: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/22910/22910-h/22910-h.htm>
- [5] Feyerabend, Paul K. Farewell to Reason. London: Verso/New Left Books, 1987, 336 pp.
- [6] Kuhn, Thomas S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. The University of Chicago Press, 1970. URL: [http://projektintegracija.pravo.hr/download/repository/Kuhn\\_Structure\\_of\\_Scientific\\_Revolutions.pdf](http://projektintegracija.pravo.hr/download/repository/Kuhn_Structure_of_Scientific_Revolutions.pdf)
- [7] Barker, Sir Ernest. The Politics of Aristotle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, 423 pp.
- [8] Harootunian, Harry. The structure of world history: from modes of production to modes of exchange. History and Theory. Vol. 54. Issue 1. Pp. 96-105, 2015